arXiv:1511.04282v1 [math.PR] 13 Nov 2015

Submitted to the Annals of Applied Probability

ON THE INSTABILITY OF MATCHING QUEUES

By Pascal Moyal[*] and Ohad Perry[†]

Université de Technologie de Compiègne[*] and Northwestern University[†]

A matching queue is described via a graph G together with a matching policy. Specifically, to each node in the graph there is a corresponding arrival process of items which can either be queued, or matched with queued items in neighboring nodes. The matching policy specifies how items are matched whenever more than one matching is possible. Motivated by the increasing theoretical interest in such matching models, we investigate the question of (in)stability of matching queues which satisfy a natural necessary condition for stability, which can be thought of as an analogue of the usual traffic condition for traditional queueing networks (namely, $\rho_i < 1$ in each service station i). We employ fluid-stability arguments to show that matching queues can in general be unstable, even though the necessary stability condition is satisfied.

1. Introduction. We consider a continuous-time matching queueing system in which items of different classes arrive one by one, and depart in pairs. Specifically, we assume that any item is either matched with exactly one other item immediately upon arrival, and both items leave the system, or is stored in a buffer until it is matched. Since matchings are pairwise, such a matching model can be represented via an undirected graph, in which each node represents a class of arrivals, and an edge between two nodes represents that items of the two corresponding classes can be matched together. A *matching policy* describes the matching rule whenever more than one matching is possible for an incoming item.

The model just described is closely related to the discrete-time *stochastic matching model* introduced in [23], in which items enter the system at discrete time points, and their class is drawn upon arrival from a given probability distribution on the set of classes. We elaborate below.

Matching models in the literature. Matching queueing models arise directly in several applications (e.g., organ transplantation [13] and public-housing assignments [30]) and can also be employed as relaxations for complex queueing and inventory systems. We refer to [1, 10, 16] for elaborate discussions on existing applications.

Primary 60K25; secondary 60F17

Keywords and phrases: matching queues, instability, fluid limits, graphs

The term *matching queues* was introduced in [16]. In that reference, items can be matched by groups of size two or more, and the goal is to minimize finite-horizon cumulative holding costs. Moreover, the controller can keep matchable items in storage for more "profitable" future matches. A myopic, discrete-review control is shown to be asymptotically optimal, as the arrival rate grows large. Thus, both the model and the objectives of [16] are different than ours here, since we consider pairwise matchings, and are concerned with stability properties.

The stability of matching models operating under the *first-come first-served* (FCFS) policy was studied for several particular graphs in [10], assuming that both the arrivals and the departures occur by pairs. (If items arrive one by one, the model can never be stable, as will become clear below.) A discrete-time Markov chain representation was employed in combination with Lyapunov techniques, to study the stability (ergodicity) of certain models having bipartite graphs. An important (and expected) observation from this latter reference is that characterizing the stability region, namely, the law of the arrival process under which the system is stable, is nontrivial even for models with relatively simple graphs.

The matching model in [10] was further analyzed in [9]. An alternative Markov representation was introduced, leading to a more complete picture of the stability problem. General sufficient and necessary conditions for stability of the underlying Markov chain were given, together with properties of several matching policies. In particular, the stability of any model applying the 'match the longest' policy (under which an item that has more than one matching option upon arrival is matched with an item from the longest queue) was proved, assuming the necessary condition for stability holds.

The necessary condition for stability in [9] wa employed in [1] to prove the existence of unique matching rates for models satisfying a certain "complete resource pooling" condition. The models considered in [1] are again bipartite and operate in the FCFS matching policy. Interestingly, the stationary distribution of the Markov chain in [1] is shown to have a product form.

In [2] a continuous-time model is considered for a bipartite matching system operating under the FCFS-ALIS (Assign Longest-Idle Server) policy. In this paper, Markovian service system (i.e., service times are considered) with skill-based routing, are modeled as matching queues, and the stationary distribution, when it exists, is shown to have a product form. Fluid limits are employed in the overloaded case to prove the existence of a local steady state.

The graphs in [1, 2, 9, 10] are all bipartite. Therefore, to make the question of stability nontrivial, items are assumed to arrive in pairs, as was mentioned

above. This assumption is dropped in [23], which introduces the aforementioned (discrete-time) stochastic matching model with general graph topology. In [23], a thorough study of the structure of the stability region of the model is proposed, partially relying on the results in [9]. A natural necessary condition, named NCOND, for the stability of **any** such stochastic matching model is introduced, implying, in particular, that no model can be stable if the matching graph is a tree, or more generally, a bipartite graph. (Hence the need for the assumption that arrivals occur in pairs in the papers cited above.) In addition, a study of a particular simple model in [23] shows that NCOND is not sufficient in general. It is conjectured that, except for a certain class of graphs, namely, the non-bipartite *separable* ones - see Definition 1 below - one can find an arrival process satisfying NCOND, together with a matching policy, under which the system is unstable. The Lyapunov-stability techniques that were employed in [23] render the proof of this conjecture impractical in the discrete settings.

As is easily seen, and will be shown in Theorem 2 below, the stability region of a discrete-time stochastic model can be studied by embedding it in an appropriate continuous-time model. Thus, the continuous-time counterparts of the results in [23] hold for our matching queues, and vice versa. The advantage of the continuous time setting is that powerful fluid-limit techniques can be employed, which greatly facilitate stability analysis.

Stability of Stochastic Networks via Fluid Limits. The necessary condition NCOND for stability, defined in (5) below, can be thought of as an analogue to the usual traffic condition of standard queueing networks, requiring that the long-term rate of arrivals to each service station be less than the long-run output rate at that station. Therefore, our work relates to the literature on (in)stability of subcritical stochastic networks, which we briefly review.

Consider a stochastic queueing network with $d \geq 1$ service stations and $K \geq 1$ classes. Let a_i^k denote the (long-run) arrival rate of class-k jobs into service station i, and let m_i^k denote the mean service time of class-k jobs in this station, $1 \leq k \leq K$. Then the system is subcritical if

$$\rho_i := \sum_k a_i^k m_i^k < 1 \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq d. \tag{1}$$

It is well-known that Condition (1) is not sufficient to ensure stability of stochastic networks in general. The first examples of this fact are the deterministic Lu-Kumar network [21] (and its stochastic counterpart; §3 in [8]), and the Rybko-Stolyar network [29], both of which consider static priority service policies. A subcritical, multiclass, two-station network, having a Poisson arrival process and exponential service times in both service stations for

all classes, was shown to be unstable under the FIFO discipline in [6]. See [8] for an elaborate discussion, including a comprehensive literature review of the subject.

The most general method to showing that a given stochastic queueing network is stable employs fluid limits. Specifically, Dai [11] showed that, under general regularity conditions, if all the (subsequential) fluid limits of the queues, for all possible initial conditions, converge to 0 in finite time, then the system is stable. However, since we are interested in demonstrating *instability* of matching queues, a unique characterization of the fluid limit is required. In particular, we must prove a functional weak-law of large numbers (FWLLN), and show that the unique fluid limit may not converge to the origin.

An interesting feature of the fluid limits we obtain is that their dynamics are determined by the stationary distribution of a "fast" *continuous-time Markov chain* (CTMC). Specifically, if the fluid queue associated with one of the nodes is positive, then the relevant time scale for this queue is slower than the time scale for the queues that are empty. In the limit, the effect of the "fast" (i.e., null) queues on the evolution of the positive fluid queues is averaged-out instantaneously, a phenomena known as a stochastic *averaging principle* (AP) in the literature. See [25, 26] and the references therein, as well as [22, 35] for recent examples of fast averaging in queueing networks.

Organization of the Paper. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we elaborate on our model and introduce the main notation and terms that will be used. In Section 3 we present our main result, Theorem 3. Section 4 develops the fluid limit (Theorem 4) and Section 5 studies models that are key to the proof of Theorem 3. Theorem 3 is proved in Section 6, building on the results of Sections 4 and 5, and the FWLLN is proved in Section 7. Implications of our results to the construction of matchings on random graphs are presented in Section 8. We conclude in Section 9 with a summary and directions for future research.

2. The Model.

In this section we describe the matching queueing model in detail, after introducing the notation and key terms that we employ.

2.1. *Basic Terms and Notation.*

We adopt the usual $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{Z}$ notation for the sets of real numbers and integers, respectively. We let $\mathbb{R}_+$ and $\mathbb{R}_{++}$ denote, respectively, the sets of non-negative and strictly positive real numbers. Similarly, $\mathbb{Z}_+$ and $\mathbb{Z}_{++}$ denote the sets of non-negative and strictly positive integers. For any two elements $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we let $[\![a, b]\!] := \{a, a+1, ..., b\}$. For a set A, we let $|A|$ denote the cardinality of A and for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$,

A^k denotes the set of k-dimensional vectors with components in A. For any $i \in [\![1,k]\!]$, the ith vector of the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^k$ is denoted by $\mathbf{e}_i$, namely, $\mathbf{e}_i$ has 1 in its ith coordinate and 0 elsewhere. For any subset $J \subset [\![1,k]\!]$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$, we use the notation x_J for the restriction of x to its coordinates corresponding to the indices of J.

For an interval $I \subset [0,\infty)$, let $\mathbb{D}^d(I)$ denote the space of $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued functions on I that are right continuous and have limits from the left everywhere, endowed with the standard Skorohod J_1 topology [4]. . To simplify notation, we write, e.g., $\mathbb{D}^d(a,b)$ instead of $\mathbb{D}^d((a,b))$, and $\mathbb{D}(I)$ for $\mathbb{D}^1(I)$ (we remove the superscript when $d=1$). We omit the interval from the notation whenever it can be taken to be an arbitrary compact interval, e.g., convergence in $\mathbb{D}^d$ holds over compact subintervals of $[0,\infty)$. We write $\mathbb{C}^d(I)$ for the subspace of continuous functions on I, with $\mathbb{C} := \mathbb{C}^1$.

Random Variables and Processes. We work on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$. We write $\overset{\mathrm{d}}{=}$ to denote equality in distribution and $\Rightarrow$ to denote convergence in distribution. For a sequence of real-valued random variables $\{Y^n : n \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}\}$ we write $Y^n \Rightarrow \infty$ if $P(Y^n > M) \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$, for any $M > 0$. The fluid-scaled version of a sequence of stochastic processes $\{Y_n : n \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}\}$ is denoted by $\bar{Y}^n := Y^n/n$.

For two real-valued stochastic processes X and Y we write $X \leq_{st} Y$ if X is smaller than Y in *sample-path stochastic order*, namely, if it is possible to construct two processes $\tilde{X}$ and $\tilde{Y}$ on a common probability space, such that $\tilde{X} \overset{\mathrm{d}}{=} X$, $\tilde{Y} \overset{\mathrm{d}}{=} Y$, and the sample paths of $\tilde{X}$ lie below those of $\tilde{Y}$ w.p.1. When X and Y are $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued, $d > 1$, $X \leq_{st} Y$ means that $X_i \leq_{st} Y_i$, for all $1 \leq i \leq d$.

Graph-Related Terms. In addition to the notation, we introduce basic terms of graph theory that will be used below. A graph G is denoted by $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{E}$ are the set of nodes and edges, respectively. The nodes of G are labeled arbitrarily in $[\![1, |\mathcal{V}|]\!]$, and we often identify $\mathcal{V}$ with $[\![1, |\mathcal{V}|]\!]$. We write $i-j$ whenever $(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}$, namely, nodes i and j are connected by an edge, and $i \not- j$ otherwise. If $i-j$, then these two nodes are said to be *neighbors*. All the graphs considered in this paper are *non-oriented*, i.e. $i-j$ if and only if $j-i$ (and the edges (i,j) and (j,i) are indistinguishable) and *simple*, *i.e.* there is no edge connecting a node to itself ($i \not- i$ for any $i \in \mathcal{V}$), and two nodes are connected by at most one edge.

For any subset A of $\mathcal{V}$, we let $\mathcal{E}(A)$ be the set of neighbors of all the nodes in A, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{E}(A) := \{j \in \mathcal{V} : i-j, \text{ for some } i \in A\}.$$

We write $\mathcal{E}(i)$ for the neighbors of a single node i (instead of $\mathcal{E}(\{i\})$).

The graph $\breve{G} = (\breve{\mathcal{V}}, \breve{\mathcal{E}})$ is said to be a *subgraph* of $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ if $\breve{\mathcal{V}} \subset \mathcal{V}$ and $\breve{\mathcal{E}} \subset \mathcal{E}$. We say that G *induces* the subgraph $\breve{G}$, whenever $\breve{\mathcal{E}}$ equals the restriction of $\mathcal{E}$ to $\breve{\mathcal{V}}^2$. In other words, if $(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}$, then $(i,j) \in \breve{\mathcal{E}}$, for all $i,j \in \breve{\mathcal{V}}$. In that case, $\breve{G}$ is said to be *induced by* $\breve{V}$ *in* G.
The complement graph of G is the graph $\bar{G} = (\bar{\mathcal{V}}, \bar{\mathcal{E}})$ such that $\bar{\mathcal{V}} = \mathcal{V}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{E}} = \mathcal{V}^2 \setminus (\mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{D}$ is the diagonal of $\mathcal{V}^2$, namely, $\mathcal{D} := \{(i,i) : i \in \mathcal{V}\}$.
For $q \geq 2$, the graph $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is said to be q-partite, $q \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$, if there exists a partition $\{\mathcal{V}_i : 1 \leq i \leq q\}$ of $\mathcal{V}$ such that

$$\mathcal{E} \subset \bigcup_{i,j \in [\![1,q]\!] : i \neq j} \mathcal{V}_i \times \mathcal{V}_j.$$

In other words, in a q-partite graph, every edge links two nodes in two distinct subsets of the partition. A 2-partite graph is called *bipartite*.

The *complete graph* $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is such that $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{V}^2 \setminus \mathcal{D}$. A *clique* of a graph G is a complete subgraph of G. The graph $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is said to be *connected* if for any $i,j \in \mathcal{V}$, there exists a path from i to j, i.e. a subset $\{i = i_1, i_2, ..., i_q = j\} \subset \mathcal{V}$ such that $i_\ell - i_{\ell+1}$ for any $\ell \in [\![1, q-1]\!]$.

An *independent set* of a graph G is a non-empty subset $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{V}$ such that $i \not\sim j$, for all $i,j \in \mathcal{I}$. We let $\mathbb{I}(G)$ denote the set of all independent sets of G. Notice that when G is simple, any node is an independent set, so that $\mathbb{I}(G)$ is nonempty. We say that the independent set $\mathcal{I}$ of G is *maximal* if, for any $j \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{I}$, we have $i_j \sim j$ for some i_j in $\mathcal{I}$. In other words, $\mathcal{I} \cup \{j\}$ is not an independent set, for any $j \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{I}$.

2.2. *Matching Queues.* The *matching queue* associated with a graph $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, an arrival-rate vector $\lambda := (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{|\mathcal{V}|})$ and a matching policy Φ, is defined as follows. Each node of the simple graph G (which we call *matching graph*) is associated with a class of items, and items of each class $i \in \mathcal{V}$ arrive to the system in accordance with a Poisson process N_i having intensity $\lambda_i > 0$. We also write

$$\bar{\lambda} := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \lambda_i \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\lambda}_A := \sum_{i \in A} \lambda_i, \quad A \subset \mathcal{V}. \tag{2}$$

We assume that all $|\mathcal{V}|$ Poisson arrival processes are independent. Class-i items can be matched with class-j items if and only if $i \sim j$, i.e., there is an edge between the two nodes $i,j \in \mathcal{V}$. We emphasize that the matching graphs G we consider are simple, so that items from the same class cannot be matched together.

Upon arrival, a class-i item is either matched with exactly one item from a class j such that $i - j$, if any such item is available, or is placed in an infinite buffer. Matched items leave the system immediately. We refer to the buffer content associated with each class i as the class-i queue, and denote the associated class-i queue process by $Q_i := \{Q_i(t) : t \geq 0\}$. Specifically, for all $t \geq 0$, $Q_i(t)$ is the number of the class-i items in queue at time t. Let

$$Q = \left(Q_1, ..., Q_{|\mathcal{V}|}\right) \tag{3}$$

denote the $|\mathcal{V}|$-dimensional queue process of the system.

Upon arrival to the system, a class-i item may find several possible matches, whenever more than one neighboring class has items queued. A *matching policy* is the rule specifying how to execute matchings in such cases. We say that a matching policy Φ is *admissible* if matchings always occur when possible, and decisions are made solely on the state of the queue at arrival epochs. Consequently, under an admissible matching policy, the queue process Q is a CTMC and $Q_iQ_j = 0$ for all $i, j \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $i-j$.

An admissible matching policy is of *priority* type if for any node i, the set $\mathcal{E}(i)$ is a-priori ordered: $\mathcal{E}(i) = \left(i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_{|\mathcal{E}(i)|}\right)$, so that, at any time t in which a class-i item enters the system, matching occurs with a class-i_m item, where

$$m = \min\left\{\ell \in [\![1, |\mathcal{E}(i)|]\!] : Q_{i_\ell}(t) > 0\right\}.$$

Clearly, the initial queue length $Q(0)$, together with G, λ and the matching policy Φ fully determine the distribution of Q. We thus characterize the system by the triple $(G, \lambda, \Phi)_{\text{C}}$ (where we append the subscript $_{\text{C}}$ to denote a *continuous-time* model, as opposed to the one in discrete time, which will be denoted with a subscript $_{\text{D}}$.)

The matching queue $(G, \lambda, \Phi)_{\text{C}}$ is said to be *stable* if the corresponding CTMC Q is ergodic, and unstable otherwise. We also say that node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ is unstable if, for some initial condition, the mean time for its associated queue to empty is infinite. Otherwise, the node is stable.

2.3. *The Necessary Condition for Stability* NCOND. An immediate question is then, what is the analogue of (1) in the context of matching queues. Clearly, it must hold that, for each node i,

$$\lambda_i < \bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{E}(i)}. \tag{4}$$

(Recall the notational convention in (2).) However, it is easy to see that (4) can hold for matching queues having bipartite matching graphs, for example, although such models are never stable. (See the discussion following the proof

of Theorem 1 below.) Thus, a meaningful necessary condition for stability should be stronger than (4).

To gain intuition, we contrast two simple examples for matching graphs, the triangle and the simplest graph including a triangle, namely the 'pendant' graph, depicted in Figures 1 and 2, respectively. For the triangle, it is straightforward that the corresponding matching queue is stable under (4) for any admissible matching policy. Indeed, at most one of the three queues is positive at any given time, and the drift of any positive queue is necessarily negative under (4). Now consider the pendant graph with the priority matching policy in Figure 2, under which node 3 gives strict priority to nodes 1 and 2, i.e. a class-3 arrival who finds items in node 4 and in one of the remaining two nodes, say node 1, will be matched with the class-1 item. This priority policy is depicted by the arrows in Figure 2. Under this policy, node 4 may be unstable despite the fact that $\lambda_4 < \lambda_3$. Indeed, for node 4 to be stable, we must have and 'adequate' number of class-3 arrivals so that, even though $\lambda_3 < \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_4$, sufficiently many class-3 items are left to be matched with all the class-4 items in the long run. Since many class 1 and class 2 items will be matched with each other, it is intuitively clear that, in addition to (4), we must require that

$$\lambda_4 + \lambda_1 < \lambda_3 + \lambda_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_4 + \lambda_2 < \lambda_3 + \lambda_1.$$



FIG 1. *Triangle*



FIG 2. *Pendant graph*

This suggests that one needs to consider the arrival rates to subsets of non-neighboring nodes, and require that those rates are smaller than the arrival rates to the neighborhoods of those subsets. Therefore, for any matching graph G, we define

$$\textsc{Ncond}_{\textsc{c}}(G) := \left\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^{|\mathcal{V}|} : \bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}} < \bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{I})} \text{ for all } \mathcal{I} \in \mathbb{I}(G)\right\},$$

where we recall that $\mathbb{I}(G)$ is the set of independent sets of G. We say that NCOND holds for G if

$$\lambda \in \textsc{Ncond}_{\textsc{c}}(G). \tag{5}$$

THEOREM 1. (*necessary condition for stability of matching queues*) *Let G be a connected graph and Φ an admissible matching policy. A necessary condition for $(G,\lambda,\Phi)_{\mathrm{C}}$ to be stable is that (5) hold.*

Before proving Theorem 1, let us briefly describe the (discrete-time) stochastic matching model introduced in [23]. Given a graph G and an admissible matching policy Φ, the discrete-time stochastic matching model $(G,\mu,\Phi)_{\mathrm{D}}$ is defined similarly to the matching queue $(G,\lambda,\Phi)_{\mathrm{C}}$, except that items enter the system one by one, at any discrete time $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$. Assuming that the sequence of classes of the items entering the system, is independent and identically distributed with a common probability measure μ on $\mathcal{V}$, $(G,\mu,\Phi)_{\mathrm{D}}$ is represented by the $\mathbb{Z}_+^{|\mathcal{V}|}$-valued discrete-time Markov Chain (DTMC) $U := \{U(n) : n \geq 1\}$, where for any $i \in \mathcal{V}$ and any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$, $U_i(n)$ counts the number of items of class i in the buffer at time n.

PROOF OF THEOREM 1. Define the following set of probability measures on $\mathcal{V}$,

$$\mathrm{NCOND}_{\mathrm{D}}(G) := \Big\{\mu \text{ with support } \mathcal{V} : \mu(\mathcal{I}) < \mu(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{I})), \text{ for all } \mathcal{I} \in \mathbb{I}(G)\Big\}$$

and for any λ, the probability measure

$$\mu_\lambda(i) := \lambda_i/\bar{\lambda}, \quad i \in \mathcal{V}. \tag{6}$$

Then for any graph G it holds that, if $\lambda \in \mathrm{NCOND}_{\mathrm{C}}(G)$, then $\mu_\lambda \in \mathrm{NCOND}_{\mathrm{D}}(G)$. On the other hand, it is immediate that, if $\{T_n : n \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}\}$ denotes the points of the superposition of the Poisson arrival processes $N_1, ..., N_{|\mathcal{V}|}$, we have the identity $Q(T_n) \stackrel{\mathrm{d}}{=} U(n)$ for all n. Hence, the positive recurrence of the DTMC U implies the ergodicity of the CTMC Q, for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}^{|\mathcal{V}|}$. The statement thus follows from Proposition 2 in [23]. □

An immediate consequence of Theorem 1 is that matching queues $(G,\lambda,\Phi)_{\mathrm{C}}$ having a connected bipartite graph G are never stable. Indeed, if $\mathcal{I}_1 \cup \mathcal{I}_2$ denotes the bipartition of $\mathcal{V}$ into maximal independent sets, then (5) implies that $\bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}_1} < \bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}_2}$ and $\bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}_1} > \bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}_2}$, so that $\mathrm{NCOND}_{\mathrm{C}}(G)$ is empty. In (i) of Theorem 2 below we show that the converse of this result also holds.

In ending we remark that (5) is equivalent to (4) for the triangle in Figure 1 or, more generally, for any complete graph. Aside from this case, condition (5) is always strictly stronger (and harder to verify) than (4). Nevertheless, it is significant that it can be verified in $O(|\mathcal{V}|^3)$ time; see Proposition 1 in [23].

3. The Main Result. The notion of a *separable graph*, introduced in [23], will play a crucial role in what follows.

DEFINITION 1. *A graph $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is said to be* separable of order q, $q \geq 2$, *if there exists a partition of $\mathcal{V}$ into maximal independent sets $\mathcal{I}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{I}_q$, such that $u - v$ for all $u \in \mathcal{I}_i$ and $v \in \mathcal{I}_j$, for all $i \neq j$.*

Equivalently, G is separable of order q if its complement graph can be partitioned into q disjoint cliques. Notice that a separable graph of order 2 is bipartite, whereas a separable graph or order 3 or more is non-bipartite.

FIG 3. *Separable graph of order* 3 *(left) and the complementary graph (right).*

We have the following consequence of Theorem 2 in [23].

THEOREM 2. *For any connected graph G the following hold.*
(i) There exits an admissible policy Φ and $\lambda \in \text{NCOND}_{\text{C}}(G)$ such that $(G, \lambda, \Phi)_{\text{C}}$ is stable if and only if G is non-bipartite;
(ii) If G is separable of order $p \geq 3$, then $(G, \lambda, \Phi)_{\text{C}}$ is stable for any admissible Φ and for all $\lambda \in \text{NCOND}_{\text{C}}(G)$.

PROOF. The arguments in the proof of Theorem 1 are again employed to apply the results for the discrete-time model in [23] to the continuous-time model considered here. In particular, by Theorem 1 in [23], the set $\text{NCOND}_{\text{C}}(G)$ is non-empty if and only if G is non-bipartite. Hence the statement in (i) follows from (16) and (17) in [23] (where the discipline 'match the longest' is shown to guarantee that any system is stable under NCOND). The statement in (ii) follows immediately from (18) in [23]. □

Thus, for the class of separable graphs, *any* matching policy achieves stability under NCOND. Consequently, a central question is whether such graphs are the *only* ones having this desired property. Our main Theorem provides a positive answer.

THEOREM 3. *The* only *connected and non-bipartite graphs G for which the matching queue $(G,\lambda,\Phi)_{\mathrm{C}}$ is stable for any admissible matching policy Φ and any $\lambda \in \mathrm{NCOND}_{\mathrm{C}}(G)$, are the separable graphs of order 3 or more.*

Applying again the arguments of the proof of Theorem 1, we obtain the following corollary to Theorem 3.

COROLLARY 1. *The converse to (ii) in Theorem 2 also holds for the discrete-time matching model. In particular, if $(G,\mu,\Phi)_{\mathrm{D}}$ is stable for any admissible Φ and for all $\mu \in \mathrm{NCOND}_{\mathrm{D}}(G)$, then G is separable of order $p \geq 3$.*

3.1. *Strategy of the Proof of Theorem 3.* To prove Theorem 3, we will show that, for any connected and non-bipartite graph G *which is not separable*, it is possible to find an admissible matching policy and a $\lambda \in \mathrm{NCOND}_{\mathrm{C}}(G)$, such that $(G,\lambda,\Phi)_{\mathrm{C}}$ is unstable. The proof of this claim hinges on the following fact, which will be proved in Section 6.1 (statement (i) in Lemma 4) : *any connected, non-bipartite and non-separable graph induces a pendant graph or an odd cycle of size 5 or more.*

Due to this result, we adopt the following strategy. We start by considering the set whose elements are the pendant graph and all the odd cycles of size 5 or more, and construct an instable model for any graph in this set under NCOND, the instability of which is shown using fluid-limit arguments. The fluid limits are developed in Section 4 below. Finally, we show a "non-chaoticity" property (Section 6.2), implying that the instability of a matching queue on a graph $\breve{G}$ induced in a graph G leads to the instability of a related matching queue on G.

3.2. *Separable and Complete Graphs.* Observe that, for any $q > 0$, the complete graph of size q is separable of order q. Conversely, any separable graph of order q can be related to the complete graph of size q in the following way. Let $G = (\mathcal{V},\mathcal{E})$ be a separable graph of order q, and denote by $\mathcal{I}_1,...,\mathcal{I}_q$ its maximal independent sets. Observe that the binary relation "$\not\sim$" is an equivalence relation in $\mathcal{V}$. If we 'contract' G by "merging" all the nodes in each equivalence class (i.e., independent set), so that each node in the contracted graph represents an independent set in G, and merge all the edges emanating from merged nodes that point to the same nodes, we obtain the complete graph $\tilde{G}$ of size q.

The connections between matching queues on separable and complete graphs is then as follows. Consider a matching queue $(G,\lambda,\Phi)_{\mathrm{C}}$ on G, where

Φ is admissible, and a matching queue $(\tilde{G}, \tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\Phi})_{\mathrm{C}}$ on $\tilde{G}$, and suppose that

$$\bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}_j} = \tilde{\lambda}_j, \quad j \in [\![1, q]\!]. \tag{7}$$

(We add a tilde to all parameters associated with $\tilde{G}$.) Observe that the matching policy $\tilde{\Phi}$ is in fact irrelevant, as long as it is admissible. Indeed, at most one class of items can be present in queue at any given time, so any incoming item can be matched with items of at most one class. Consequently, it follows from (7) that, if the initial conditions of the two systems are such that

$$Q_{\mathcal{I}_j}(0) \stackrel{\mathrm{d}}{=} \tilde{Q}_j(0), \quad j \in [\![1, q]\!],$$

then

$$\{Q_{\mathcal{I}_j}(t) : t \geq 0\} \stackrel{\mathrm{d}}{=} \{\tilde{Q}_j(t) : t \geq 0\}, \quad j \in [\![1, q]\!].$$

In other words, if one adopts a 'macroscopic' view of the matching queue $(G, \lambda, \Phi)_{\mathrm{C}}$, by only keeping track of the independent set present in queue at any time (there is at most one), and not on the particular class of the items, then the matching queue on G amounts to a matching queue on $\tilde{G}$. Theorem 3 then implies that the only graphs that are guaranteed to be stable under any matching queue when NCOND holds, are *macroscopically* (as was just described), complete graphs of size 3 or more.

4. Fluid Stability. We now take a detour to develop the fluid limit which will be used in the proof of Theorem 3. Throughout this section, we fix a matching queue $(G, \lambda, \Phi)_{\mathrm{C}}$, where Φ is of priority type, so that Q in (3) is a CTMC with state space

$$\mathbb{G} := \Big\{ z \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{|\mathcal{V}|} : \, z_i z_j = 0, \ \text{ for any } i \in \mathcal{V} \text{ and } j \in \mathcal{E}(i) \Big\}. \tag{8}$$

To obtain the FWLLN, we consider the sequence of fluid-scaled processes $\{\bar{Q}^n : n \geq 1\}$, defined via

$$\bar{Q}^n(t) = \frac{Q^n(t)}{n} := \frac{Q(nt)}{n}, \ t \geq 0, \quad n \geq 1. \tag{9}$$

We will use the notation $N_i^n(\cdot)$ for the time-scaled Poisson arrival process to node i, namely, $N_i^n(\cdot) = N_i(n\cdot)$, $i \in \mathcal{V}$.

The insufficiency of NCOND to ensure the stability of a given matching queue will be shown via the following lemma.

LEMMA 1. *If there exists an initial condition $Q^n(0) \in \mathbb{G}$ such that $\bar{Q}^n \Rightarrow \bar{Q}$ in $\mathbb{D}^{|\mathcal{V}|}$ as $n \to \infty$ and $\mathcal{P} := \{i \in \mathcal{V} : \bar{Q}_i(0) > 0\} \neq \emptyset$, and if for some $i \in \mathcal{P}$ it holds that $\bar{Q}_i$ is nondecreasing, then Q is either transient or null recurrent. In particular, the corresponding matching queue $(G, \lambda, \Phi)_{\mathrm{C}}$ is unstable.*

PROOF. By Proposition 9.9 in [28], if Q is positive recurrent there exists a (possibly random) time $\mathcal{T}$, such that $\mathcal{T} < \infty$ w.p.1 and $\bar{Q}(t) = 0$ for all $t \geq \mathcal{T}$. □

4.1. *Sample-Path Representation.* Before introducing the FWLLN, it is helpful to consider the sample-path representation of the corresponding CTMC Q. To that end, note that for each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, $Q_i(t)$ increases by 1 at time t if there is an arrival to node i at that time t and $Q_j(t) = 0$ for all $j \in \mathcal{E}(i)$; $Q_i(t)$ decreases by 1 at time t (when it is positive) if there is an arrival to one of its neighbors $j \in \mathcal{E}(i)$, and all the buffers in $\mathcal{E}(j)$ to which j gives a higher priority are empty. To express these dynamics, we introduce the following subsets of $\mathbb{G}$. For any $i \in \mathcal{V}$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_i &:= \{z \in \mathbb{G};\, z_i > 0\}\,; \\ \mathcal{O}_i &:= \{z \in \mathbb{G} : z_j = 0 \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathcal{E}(i)\}; \\ \mathcal{P}_j(i) &:= \{z \in \mathbb{G} : z_k = 0 \quad \text{for all } k \in \Phi_j(i)\},\ j \in \mathcal{E}(i), \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where $\Phi_j(i)$ is the list of all the neighbors of node j to which node j gives a higher priority than to node i, namely,

$$\Phi_j(i) = \{k \in \mathcal{E}(j);\, j \text{ gives priority to } k \text{ over } i\}\,.$$

Then the instantaneous rates of the CTMC Q are as follows. For all $t \geq 0$,

$$Q(t) = \begin{cases} Q(t-) + \mathbf{e}_i & \text{with rate } \lambda_i \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{O}_i}(Q(t-)); \\ Q(t-) - \mathbf{e}_i & \text{with rate } \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{N}_i}(Q(t-)) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}(i)} \left(\lambda_j \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{P}_j(i)}(Q(t-))\right), \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

where $Q(t-)$ denotes the left limit of Q at t. Consequently (see, e.g., [24]), for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$, we can represent the sample path of Q_i using the independent Poisson arrival processes N_i, $i \in \mathcal{V}$, via

$$\begin{aligned} Q_i(t) = Q_i(0) &+ \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{O}_i}(Q(s-))dN_i(s) \\ &- \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{N}_i}(Q(s-)) \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}(i)} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{P}_j(i)}(Q(s-))\right) dN_j\,(s)\,, \quad t \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where $\mathbb{1}_A(\cdot)$ is the indicator function of the set A.

For example, for the pendant graph in which node 3 prioritizes nodes 1 and 2 over 4, as depicted in Figure 2, the subsets in (10) become

$$\mathcal{O}_4 = \{z \in \mathbb{G} : z_3 = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{P}_3(4) = \{z \in \mathbb{G} : z_1 = z_2 = 0\}\,.$$

The sample paths of Q_4 in that case can be represented via

$$Q_4(t) = Q_4(0) + \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{O}_4}(Q(s-))dN_4(s) - \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{N}_4 \cap \mathcal{P}_3(4)}(Q(s-))dN_3(s).$$

4.2. *The FWLLN.*

The Critical node and Marginal Process. The fluid limit we are about to introduce is formulated for a particular class of models, exhibiting the following situation. When fixing the arrival-rate vector λ and the admissible matching policy Φ, and when isolating a single node, say i_0, for which we take the corresponding initial buffer content $Q_{i_0}(0)$ to be strictly positive, the content process of all the nodes in $\mathcal{V} \setminus (\{i_0\} \cup \mathcal{E}(i_0))$ coincides in law with an ergodic CTMC. Since we study the stability of that node i_0, we say that this node is *critical*, and the latter CTMC is the *marginal process* corresponding to node i_0. Hence, we partition $\mathcal{V}$ into the two subsets $\mathcal{C} := \{i_0\} \cup \mathcal{E}(i_0)$ and $\mathcal{S} := \mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{C}$.

Formally, if we index the elements of $\mathcal{S}$ as follows,

$$\mathcal{S} = \left\{i_1, ..., i_{|\mathcal{S}|}\right\},$$

the nth marginal process corresponding to node i_0 is distributed as the $\mathbb{Z}_+^{|\mathcal{S}|}$-valued CTMC $\chi^n := \{\chi^n(t) : t \geq 0\}$, whose infinitesimal generator $\mathscr{A}^n$ is

$$\begin{cases} \mathscr{A}^n(x, x + \mathbf{e}_\ell) & = \lambda^n_{i_\ell} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{O}_{i_\ell}}(x), \ \ell \in [\![1, |\mathcal{S}|]\!]; \\ \mathscr{A}^n(x, x - \mathbf{e}_\ell) & = \mathbb{1}_{\{x_\ell > 0\}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}(i_\ell) \cap \mathcal{C}} \left(\lambda^n_j \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{P}_j(i_\ell)}(x)\right), \ \ell \in [\![1, |\mathcal{S}|]\!]. \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$ and let S^n denote the queue process corresponding to the nodes in $\mathcal{S}$, i.e.,

$$S^n := Q^n_{\mathcal{S}} = (Q^n_i : i \in \mathcal{S}).$$

For the fluid analysis, we make two assumptions.

Assumption 1. *$Q^n(0) \in \mathbb{G}$ for any $n \geq 1$, and $\bar{Q}^n(0) \Rightarrow \bar{Q}(0)$ as $n \to \infty$, where $\bar{Q}(0)$ is a deterministic element of $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}|}$, with $\bar{Q}_{i_0}(0) > 0$ and $\bar{Q}_i(0) = 0$, $i \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{i_0\}$.*

Assumption 2. *For all $n \geq 1$, the $\mathbb{Z}_+^{|\mathcal{S}|}$-valued process χ^n is ergodic with stationary probability π^n.*

For $n \geq 1$, let

$$\rho^n := \rho^n(Q^n(0)) := \inf\{t \geq 0 : Q^n_{i_0}(t) = 0\}, \tag{14}$$

with $\inf \emptyset := \infty$.

LEMMA 2. *Consider the sequence* $\{\bar{Q}^n : n \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}\}$ *corresponding to a system* $(G, \lambda, \Phi)_{\mathrm{C}}$. *Then there exist* $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ *and* $\delta > 0$ *such that* $\rho^n(Q^n(0)) > \delta$ *w.p.1 for all* $n \geq n_0$. *In particular, there exists* $n_0 < \infty$, *such that*

$$\inf_{0 \leq t < \delta} \bar{Q}^n_{i_0}(t) > 0 \text{ w.p.1} \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_0. \tag{15}$$

PROOF. We use a simple coupling argument. Consider the matching queue $(G, \lambda, \widetilde{\Phi})_{\mathrm{C}}$ (with the same graph G and arrival-rate vector λ as in the statement of the lemma), where $\widetilde{\Phi}$ is the priority policy under which each $i \in \mathcal{E}(i_0)$ gives the highest priority to node i_0. If the corresponding queue process $\widetilde{Q}^n$ is given the same Poisson processes $\{N^n_i : i \in \mathcal{V}\}$ of the original system, we clearly have

$$Q^n_{i_0}(t) \geq \widetilde{Q}^n_{i_0}(t) := Q^n_{i_0}(0) + N_{i_0}(nt) - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}(i_0)} N_j(nt), \quad 0 \leq t \leq \delta^n,$$

where $\delta^n := \inf\{t > 0 : \widetilde{Q}^n_{i_0}(t) = 0\}$.

Dividing $\widetilde{Q}^n_{i_0}$ by n and taking $n \to \infty$, we obtain from the functional strong law of large numbers (FSLLN) for the Poisson process, that $\widetilde{Q}^n/n$ converges w.p.1 to $\widetilde{q}$, where

$$\widetilde{q}_{i_0}(t) := \bar{Q}_{i_0}(0) + \left(\lambda_{i_0} - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}(i_0)} \lambda_j\right) t, \quad 0 \leq t < \delta, \tag{16}$$

where

$$\delta := \frac{\bar{Q}_{i_0}(0)}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}(i_0)} \lambda_j - \lambda_{i_0}} \quad \text{if} \quad \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}(i_0)} \lambda_j - \lambda_{i_0} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \delta := \infty \text{ otherwise.}$$

The uniform convergence over compact subintervals of $[0, \delta)$ of the lower bounding processes $\widetilde{Q}^n_{i_0}/n$ to a strictly positive function gives (15). □

Before presenting the fluid limit, we explain the intuition behind the expression for $\bar{Q}_{i_0}$ that we obtain. Since S^n is locally (over $[0, \delta)$) distributed the same as a CTMC, which is ergodic by Assumption 2, it is not hard to

show that $\bar{S}^n$ converges to 0 over that interval; see the proof of Theorem 4. Nevertheless, the dynamics of $\bar{S}^n$ determine those of $\bar{Q}^n_{i_0}$ for each n, as is clear from (12), and the affect of $\bar{S}^n$ on $\bar{Q}^n_{i_0}$ does not diminish as n increases to infinity. However, the "small" process S^n is also "fast" relative to $\bar{Q}^n_{i_0}$, in the following sense. Since $\bar{Q}_{i_0}$ is strictly positive over an interval $[0, \delta)$ by Lemma 2, it follows from (11) that, if $S^n(0) \stackrel{\mathrm{d}}{=} \chi^n(0)$ for all $n \geq 1$, then (13) describes the infinitesimal rates of S^n over $[0, \delta)$, so that

$$\{S^n(t) : 0 \leq t < \delta\} \stackrel{\mathrm{d}}{=} \{\chi^n(t) : 0 \leq t < \delta\}. \tag{17}$$

Further, the time scaling in (9) implies that

$$\{\chi^n(t) : t \in [0, T)\} \stackrel{\mathrm{d}}{=} \{\chi(t) : t \in [0, nT)\}, \tag{18}$$

where $\chi := \chi^1$. Therefore, regardless of the distribution of $\chi^n(0)$, the equality in distribution (18) suggests that $\chi^n(t) \stackrel{d}{\approx} \chi(\infty)$, for any $t > 0$ and for all large-enough n, where $\chi(\infty)$ denotes a random variable having the stationary distribution of χ. (We write $\stackrel{d}{\approx}$ if, in the limit as $n \to \infty$, the distribution of $\chi^n(t)$ at time t converges to the stationary distribution of χ, i.e., $\chi^n(t) \Rightarrow \chi(\infty)$ in $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|}$.) Then (17) implies that $S^n(t)$ converges to $\chi(\infty)$ as well as $n \to \infty$, $0 < t < \delta$. Such a result is known in the queueing literature as a *pointwise stationarity*, e.g., [32]. Of course, to obtain a FWLLN, the convergence must hold uniformly in t over the interval $[0, \delta)$, namely, the aforementioned stochastic AP must hold, but the intuition for the fast averaging phenomenon is similar.

Formally, let π denote the stationary distribution of the CTMC $\chi = \chi^1$ whose generator $\mathscr{A}$ is given in (13) for $n = 1$, i.e.,

$$\pi(\mathcal{Z}) = P(\chi(\infty) \in \mathcal{Z}), \quad \mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathbb{G}. \tag{19}$$

THEOREM 4. *(FWLLN) Let $(G, \lambda, \Phi)_{\mathrm{C}}$ be a matching queue such that Φ is of the priority type. If*

$$\lambda_{i_0} - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}(i_0)} \lambda_j \pi(\mathcal{P}_j(i_0)) < 0, \tag{20}$$

for π in (19), then $\rho^n \Rightarrow \rho$ in $\mathbb{R}$ as $n \to \infty$, for ρ^n in (14), where

$$\rho := \frac{\bar{Q}_{i_0}(0)}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}(i_0)} \lambda_j \pi(\mathcal{P}_j(i_0)) - \lambda_{i_0}}. \tag{21}$$

Otherwise, $\rho^n \Rightarrow \infty$. *In either case,* $\bar{Q}^n \Rightarrow \bar{Q}$ *in* $\mathbb{D}^{|\mathcal{V}|}[0,\rho)$ *as* $n \to \infty$, *where*

$$\bar{Q}_{i_0}(t) = \bar{Q}_{i_0}(0) + \left(\lambda_{i_0} - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}(i_0)} \lambda_j \pi(\mathcal{P}_j(i_0))\right) t, \tag{22}$$
$$\bar{Q}_i(t) = 0, \quad i \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{i_0\}.$$

The proof of Theorem 4 is given in Section 7.
From Theorem 4 and Lemma 1 it immediately follows that

COROLLARY 2. *If* $\rho^n \Rightarrow \infty$, *for* ρ^n *in* (14), *then* $(G,\lambda,\Phi)_{\mathrm{C}}$ *is unstable.*

It is significant that we can compute the stationary probabilities $\pi(\cdot)$ in (4) in some cases, using reversibility arguments, or bound these probabilities in general, employing reversible CTMC's as stochastic-order bounds for the process χ.

5. The Pendant Graph and the Odd Cycles. In this section we analyze matching queues defined on the pendant graph and the set of odd cycles, using the fluid limit in Theorem 4. For these graphs, the state space of the marginal processes χ is of the form

$$\mathbb{E}_k := \left\{x \in \mathbb{Z}_+^k;\ x_i x_{i+1} = 0 \text{ for any } i \in [\![1, k-1]\!]\right\}, \quad k \geq 2. \tag{23}$$

In the first two examples we consider - the pendant graph and the cycle of length 5 - and for the priority rules we consider, π can be computed explicitly, so that the stability region of the corresponding matching queues can be fully characterized.

5.1. *The Pendant graph.* We start with the simplest model, namely, the pendant graph.

PROPOSITION 1. *Let* G *be the pendant graph and* Φ *the matching policy depicted in Figure 2. Consider an arrival-rate vector* $\lambda \in \mathrm{NCOND}_{\mathrm{C}}(G)$, *i.e.,*

$$\lambda_4 < \lambda_3 < \lambda_4 + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2, \quad \lambda_4 + \lambda_1 < \lambda_3 + \lambda_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_4 + \lambda_2 < \lambda_3 + \lambda_1. \tag{24}$$

If $\bar{Q}^n(0) \Rightarrow x\mathbf{e}_4$ *in* $\mathbb{R}^4$ *for some* $x \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, *then* $\bar{Q}^n \Rightarrow \bar{Q}$ *in* $\mathbb{D}^4[0,\rho)$ *as* $n \to \infty$, *where*

$$\bar{Q}(t) = (0,0,0,x + (\lambda_4 - \lambda_3\alpha)\, t)\,, \quad 0 \leq t < \rho, \tag{25}$$

for $\rho := x/(\lambda_3\alpha - \lambda_4)$ *if* $\alpha > \lambda_4/\lambda_3$ *and* $\rho := \infty$ *otherwise, and for*

$$\alpha := \left[1 + \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_3 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_1} + \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_3 + \lambda_1 - \lambda_2}\right]^{-1} = \frac{(\lambda_3)^2 - (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2}{\lambda_3(\lambda_3 + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2)}. \tag{26}$$

PROOF. The result follows from Theorem 4. In the present case, we set $i_0 = 4$, so that the marginal process χ is the $\mathbb{E}_2$-valued CTMC having the following generator,

$$\mathscr{A}(u,v) = \begin{cases} \lambda_1 & \text{for } u=(i,0) \text{ and } v=(i+1,0),\ i \geq 0; \\ \lambda_3+\lambda_2 & \text{for } u=(i,0) \text{ and } v=(i-1,0),\ i \geq 1; \\ \lambda_2 & \text{for } u=(0,i) \text{ and } v=(0,i+1),\ i \geq 0; \\ \lambda_3+\lambda_1 & \text{for } u=(0,i) \text{ and } v=(0,i-1),\ i \geq 1; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{27}$$

For α in (26), let $\pi(0,0) = \alpha$ and

$$\pi(u) = \begin{cases} \alpha \left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_3+\lambda_2}\right)^i & \text{for } u=(i,0),\ i \geq 1; \\ \alpha \left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_3+\lambda_1}\right)^j & \text{for } u=(0,j),\ i \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to check that under (24), π is a probability vector satisfying the detailed balance equations for χ, so that it is the unique stationary distribution of this reversible CTMC. In particular, Assumption 2 holds. The stated convergence of Q^n to the fluid limit in (25) now follows from (22). □

PROPOSITION 2. *For α in (26), the condition $\alpha > \lambda_4/\lambda_3$ is necessary for the stability of the model $(G,\lambda,\Phi)_{\mathrm{C}}$ corresponding to the pendant graph G.*

PROOF. It follows from Proposition 1 that for any initial condition of the form $(0,0,0,x)$, $x > 0$, the fluid limit $\bar{Q}$ will hit the origin if and only if $\lambda_4/\lambda_3 < \alpha$. The result follows from Lemma 1. □

In the present model, node 4 is the only node whose stability is not immediate under (24). Therefore,

COROLLARY 3. *The matching queue $(G,\lambda,\Phi)_{\mathrm{C}}$ corresponding to the pendant graph G is stable if and only if* NCOND *holds and $\alpha > \lambda_4/\lambda_3$.*

PROOF. To show sufficiency we apply Dai's result in [11]. To that end, we must consider *all possible initial conditions* for the fluid limit, and show that the origin is guaranteed to be hit in finite time.

First assume that $\bar{Q}_3(0) > 0$, so that all other queues are empty initially. In that case, and as long as the class-3 queue is strictly positive, its drift down (toward 0) is $\lambda_4+\lambda_1+\lambda_2$, which is larger than the drift up λ_3 by (24). In particular, during the initial interval over which $\bar{Q}_3 > 0$, the class-3 queue

is distributed as an ergodic birth and death (BD) process whose fluid limit is known to be (*e.g.*, Proposition 5.16 in [28])

$$\bar{Q}_3(t) = \bar{Q}_3(0) + (\lambda_3 - \lambda_4 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2)t, \quad 0 \le t \le \frac{\bar{Q}_3(0)}{\lambda_4 + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_3},$$

so that the fluid queue hits the origin in finite time.

Now assume that $\bar{Q}_4(0) > 0$. Then at most one of $\bar{Q}_1(0)$ or $\bar{Q}_2(0)$ can be strictly positive. Say $\bar{Q}_1(0) > 0$. In that case, the matching policy we consider implies that, as long as $\bar{Q}_1 > 0$, all the arriving items of classes 3 and 2 are matched with class-1 items. Hence, as long as the class-1 queue process is positive, it is distributed as a BD process having a constant birth rate λ_1 and a constant death rate $\lambda_3 + \lambda_2$. This BD process is ergodic due to (24), and its fluid limit is

$$\bar{Q}_1(t) = \bar{Q}_1(0) + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_2)t, \quad 0 \le t \le \frac{\bar{Q}_1(0)}{\lambda_3 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_1}.$$

In particular, the fluid process $\bar{Q}_1$ will hit 0 in finite time, so that $\bar{Q}$ will hit the origin in finite time by Proposition 2. A similar argument applies when $\bar{Q}_2(0) > 0$.

Now, since the prelimit processes Q_i, $i = 1, 2, 3$ have drifts towards 0 whenever any of them is strictly positive, the fluid limit must remain in state 0 after hitting this state, and Proposition 1 shows that $\bar{Q}_4$ will also remain fixed at 0 after hitting that state. Thus, the ergodicity of the system follows from Theorem 4.2 in [11]. □

From Corollary 3 we conclude that the stability region of the model in Figure 2 is

$$\textsc{Ncond}_{\textsc{c}}(G) \cap \{\lambda : \lambda_4/\lambda_3 < \alpha\} \subsetneq \textsc{Ncond}_{\textsc{c}}(G).$$

Remark 1. A discrete version of Corollary 3 was proved in [23] for the symmetric model $(G, \mu, \Phi)_{\textsc{d}}$ in which $\mu(1) = \mu(2)$ (so that a lower-dimensional process can be considered), via subtle Lyapunov-stability arguments. Plugging $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$ in (26) and recalling (6), Corollary 3 gives that the discrete model $(G, \mu_\lambda, \Phi)_{\textsc{d}}$ corresponding to Figure 2 is stable if and only if $(\mu_\lambda(3))^2 > \mu_\lambda(4)(1 - \mu_\lambda(4))$ and $\mu_\lambda(4) < \mu_\lambda(3) < \mu_\lambda(4) + 2\mu_\lambda(1)$, retrieving the stability condition that was established in Proposition 3 in [23].

5.2. *The 5-cycle.* We now consider the matching queue corresponding to the cycle of length 5 (5-cycle, for short), under the priority policy depicted in

Figure 4: nodes 1 and 2 prioritize each other, node 3 gives priority to node 1, and node 4 gives priority to node 2. For concreteness, we assume that node 5 gives priority to node 4.

As for the pendant graph analyzed above, the stability region of the 5-dimensional CTMC Q is challenging, even in symmetric cases; However, stability analysis is made considerably more simple *via* the fluid limits analysis. In particular, we now obtain a necessary and sufficient condition for stability of the matching queue corresponding to the 5-cycle and the matching policy Φ specified above, so that the stability region of the model is fully characterized. A weaker result was established in Proposition 4 of [23], where it was only shown (for a symmetric model) that there exists a measure μ in $\textsc{Ncond}_{\textsc{d}}(G)$ for which node 5, and thus the corresponding model $(G,\mu,\Phi)_{\textsc{d}}$, is unstable.



FIG 4. *A matching queue on the 5-cycle.*

REMARK 2. As in Figure 4, for notational convenience, in any odd cycle with $2p+1$ nodes we let the "top" node be node $2p+1$, its neighbors are $\{2p-1, 2p\}$, while the nodes of the fast CTMC χ are numbered $1,\ldots,2p-2$; see Figures 4 and 5.

Let

$$a_1 := \frac{\lambda_3(\lambda_1+\lambda_4)}{\lambda_1+\lambda_4-\lambda_2} \quad \text{and} \quad a_2 := \frac{\lambda_4(\lambda_2+\lambda_3)}{\lambda_2+\lambda_3-\lambda_1}. \tag{28}$$

PROPOSITION 3. *Let G be the 5-cycle, Φ be the priority matching policy depicted in Figure 4, and consider $\lambda \in \textsc{Ncond}_{\textsc{c}}(G)$. Assume that for some $x \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, $\bar{Q}^n(0) \Rightarrow x\,\mathbf{e}_5$ in $\mathbb{R}^5$. Then, $\bar{Q}^n \Rightarrow \bar{Q}$ in $\mathbb{D}^5[0,\tilde{\rho})$ as $n\to\infty$, where, for a_1 and a_2 in (28),*

$$\bar{Q}(t) = \Big(0,0,0,0,x+(\lambda_0-(a_1+a_2)\tilde{\alpha})\,t\Big), \quad 0 \le t < \tilde{\rho};$$

for

$$\tilde{\alpha} = \left[1 + \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \lambda_1} + \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_4 - \lambda_2}\right]^{-1}, \tag{29}$$

and

$$\tilde{\rho} = \frac{x}{(a_1 + a_2)\tilde{\alpha} - \lambda_5} \quad \textit{if} \quad \tilde{\alpha} > \frac{\lambda_5}{a_1 + a_2} \quad \textit{and} \quad \tilde{\rho} := \infty \ \textit{otherwise.}$$

Note that $\textsc{Ncond}_{\textsc{c}}(G)$ implies that a_1 and a_2 in (28) and $\tilde{\alpha}$ in (29) are well-defined. To see this, consider the independent sets $\{1\}$ and $\{2\}$, whose neighboring sets are $\mathcal{E}(1) = \{2, 3\}$ and $\mathcal{E}(2) = \{1, 4\}$, respectively.

PROOF. Set $i_0 = 5$. In this case, the associated $\mathbb{E}_2$-valued marginal process χ has the following generator,

$$\tilde{\mathscr{A}}(u, v) = \begin{cases} \lambda_1 & \text{for } u = (i, 0) \text{ and } v = (i + 1, 0),\ i \geq 0; \\ \lambda_3 + \lambda_2 & \text{for } u = (i, 0) \text{ and } v = (i - 1, 0),\ i \geq 1; \\ \lambda_2 & \text{for } u = (0, i) \text{ and } v = (0, i + 1),\ i \geq 0; \\ \lambda_1 + \lambda_4 & \text{for } u = (0, i) \text{ and } v = (0, i - 1),\ i \geq 1; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{30}$$

As in the proof of Proposition 1, one can easily check that, under $\textsc{Ncond}_{\textsc{c}}(G)$ (take the independent sets $\{1\}$ and $\{2\}$),

$$\tilde{\pi}(u) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\alpha}\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_3 + \lambda_2}\right)^i & \text{for } u = (i, 0),\ i \in \mathbb{Z}_+; \\ \tilde{\alpha}\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_4}\right)^j & \text{for } u = (0, j),\ i \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \end{cases}$$

is the unique stationary distribution of χ. The statement follows from Theorem 4. □

COROLLARY 4. *A necessary condition for the matching queue in Figure 4 to be stable is*

$$\tilde{\alpha} > \lambda_5/(a_1 + a_2). \tag{31}$$

We next present a sufficient condition for the stability of the matching queue corresponding to Figure 4. Unlike the pendant graph, that sufficient condition is strictly stronger than the necessary condition of Corollary 4. First note that nodes 1 and 2 are always stable, for any λ in $\textsc{Ncond}_{\textsc{c}}(G)$. This can be seen without any fluid analysis, by observing that the drift down of the class 1 queue process, whenever the latter is positive, equals $\lambda_2 + \lambda_3$, which is strictly less than the drift up λ_1. Similarly, the downward drift to 0 of the class 2 queue process is $\lambda_1 + \lambda_4$, which is less than the upward drift λ_2. It remains to consider nodes 3 and 4.

Stability of Node 3. If $\bar{Q}_3(0) > 0$, then $\bar{Q}_3$ is strictly positive over an interval $I \subset [0,\infty)$. Over this interval I, the class-2 and class-4 queue processes behave as a fast-time-scale CTMC. Just as Proposition 3, from Theorem 4 we obtain that, if $\bar{Q}^n(0) \Rightarrow \bar{Q}_3(0)$ and $\bar{Q}^n_i(0) \Rightarrow 0$, $i \neq 3$ in $\mathbb{R}$ as $n \to \infty$, then $\bar{Q}^n \Rightarrow \bar{Q}$ in $\mathbb{D}^5[0,\rho_3)$ as $n \to \infty$, where

$$\begin{cases} \bar{Q}_3(t) &= \bar{Q}_3(0) + \Big[\lambda_3 - (c_0+c_1)\alpha_{(2,4)}\Big]t, \quad 0 \le t < \rho_3, \\ \bar{Q}_i(t) &= 0, \quad 0 \le t < \rho_3, \quad i \in [\![1,5]\!] \setminus \{3\}, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\alpha_{(2,4)} := \left(1 + \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1+\lambda_4-\lambda_2} + \frac{\lambda_4}{\lambda_5+\lambda_2-\lambda_4}\right)^{-1},$$
$$c_0 := \frac{\lambda_5(\lambda_1+\lambda_4)}{\lambda_1+\lambda_4-\lambda_2} \quad \text{and} \quad c_1 := \frac{\lambda_1(\lambda_5+\lambda_2)}{\lambda_5+\lambda_2-\lambda_4},$$
$$\rho_3 := \frac{\bar{Q}_3(0)}{(c_0+c_1)\alpha_{(2,4)} - \lambda_3} \quad \text{if} \quad \alpha_{(2,4)} > \frac{\lambda_3}{c_0+c_1} \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_3 := \infty, \text{ otherwise.}$$

Hence, in addition to requiring that $\textsc{Ncond}_{\textsc{c}}(G)$ holds, we must have $\rho_3 < \infty$, so that the fluid limit $\bar{Q}_3$ reaches 0 in finite time. In particular, a necessary condition for the stability of the model is that

$$\alpha_{(2,4)} > \lambda_3\ (c_0+c_1), \tag{32}$$

which is not implied by the necessary condition in Corollary 4.

Stability of Node 4. Since node 5 gives priority to class 4 over class 3, the instantaneous downward drift of the class 4 queue process, at any time t in which it is strictly positive, is $\lambda_5 + \lambda_2 \mathbb{1}_{\{Q_2(t)=0\}}$, while its upward drift is the constant λ_4. Then, Theorem 4 implies again that, if $\bar{Q}^n_4(0) \Rightarrow \bar{Q}_4(0)$, for some $\bar{Q}_4(0) > 0$, and $\bar{Q}^n_i(0) \Rightarrow 0$ in $\mathbb{R}$ as $n \to \infty$, $i \neq 4$, then over some interval $I \subset [0,\infty)$ it holds that $\bar{Q}^n \Rightarrow \bar{Q}$ in $\mathbb{D}^5[0,\rho_4)$, where

$$\begin{cases} \bar{Q}_4(t) &= \bar{Q}_4(0) + \big(\lambda_4 - \lambda_5 - \lambda_2\alpha_{(1,3)}\big)\, t, \quad 0 \le t < \rho_4, \\ \bar{Q}_i(t) &= 0, \quad 0 \le t < \rho_4, \quad i \in [\![1,5]\!] \setminus \{4\}, \end{cases}$$

for

$$\alpha_{(1,3)} := \frac{\lambda_2+\lambda_3-\lambda_1}{\lambda_2+\lambda_3},$$

and

$$\rho_4 := \frac{\bar{Q}_4(0)}{\lambda_5 + \lambda_2\alpha_{(1,3)} - \lambda_4} \quad \text{if } \alpha_{(1,3)} > (\lambda_4-\lambda_5)/\lambda_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_4 := \infty \text{ otherwise.}$$

Therefore, in order for node 4 to be stable, we require that, in addition to having $\text{NCOND}_{\text{C}}(G)$ hold, $\rho_4 < \infty$, or equivalently,

$$\alpha_{(1,3)} > (\lambda_4 - \lambda_5)/\lambda_2. \tag{33}$$

The Stability Region of the model of Figure 4. Similarly to the proof of Corollary 3, one can show that if each of the necessary conditions for stability of each of the nodes holds, then the model is stable. In particular,

PROPOSITION 4. *The model $(G, \lambda, \Phi)_{\text{C}}$ corresponding to the 5-cycle and the matching policy in Figure 4 is stable if and only if $\lambda \in \text{NCOND}_{\text{C}}(G)$ and all three inequalities (31), (32) and (33) hold.*

5.3. *Instability In Odd Cycles.* We now employ the fluid limit in Theorem 4 and Corollary 2 to show that, for a given priority matching policy Φ, $(G, \lambda, \Phi)_{\text{C}}$ can be unstable, with G being any cycle of odd length that is greater than 5, and $\lambda \in \text{NCOND}_{\text{C}}(G)$. Specifically, consider a matching queue corresponding to the cycle of length $2p+1$, where $p \geq 3$, with the following priority matching policy (represented by the arrows in Figure 5):

- for any $i \in [\![1, p-1]\!]$, i gives priority to $i+1$ over $i-1$;
- for any $i \in [\![p, 2p-2]\!]$, i prioritizes $i-1$ over $i+1$;
- $2p-1$ gives priority to 1 over $2p+1$;
- $2p$ prioritizes $2p-2$ over $2p+1$;
- the priority given by $2p+1$ (to $2p-1$ or $2p$) is arbitrary.



FIG 5. *A matching queue on the odd cycle*

Fix an arrival-rate vector λ such that

$$
\text{(34)} \qquad \begin{cases} \lambda \in \text{NCOND}_{\text{C}}(G); \\ \lambda_{2p-1} > \lambda_1; \\ \lambda_{2p} > \lambda_{2p-2}; \\ \lambda_i > \lambda_{i+1},\ i \in [\![1, p-2]\!]; \\ \lambda_i < \lambda_{i+1},\ i \in [\![p, 2p-3]\!]. \end{cases}
$$

We next find a λ satisfying (34) for which the matching queue on the odd cycle in Figure 5 is unstable. (An example is given in the proof of Corollary 5.)

We consider node $2p+1$ to be the critical node. In this case, the corresponding $\mathbb{E}_{2p-2}$-valued marginal process χ has the following generator. For all $y, z \in \mathbb{E}_{2p-2}$,

$$
\begin{cases}
\mathscr{A}(y, y-\mathbf{e}_1) & = \lambda_{2p-1} + \lambda_2 \text{ if } y_1 > 0 \text{ and } y_3 = 0; \\
\mathscr{A}(y, y-\mathbf{e}_1) & = \lambda_{2p-1} \text{ if } y_1 > 0 \text{ and } y_3 > 0; \\
\mathscr{A}(y, y+\mathbf{e}_1) & = \lambda_1 \text{ if } y_2 = 0; \\
\mathscr{A}(y, y-\mathbf{e}_{2p-2}) & = \lambda_{2p} + \lambda_{2p-3} \text{ if } y_{2p-2} > 0 \text{ and } y_{2p-4} = 0; \\
\mathscr{A}(y, y-\mathbf{e}_{2p-2}) & = \lambda_{2p} \text{ if } y_{2p-2} > 0 \text{ and } y_{2p-4} > 0; \\
\mathscr{A}(y, y+\mathbf{e}_{2p-2}) & = \lambda_{2p-2} \text{ if } y_{2p-3} = 0; \\
\mathscr{A}(y, y-\mathbf{e}_i) & = \lambda_{i-1} + \lambda_{i+1} \text{ if } y_i > 0 \text{ and } y_{i+2} = 0, \text{ for } i \in [\![2, p-2]\!]; \\
\mathscr{A}(y, y-\mathbf{e}_i) & = \lambda_{i-1} \text{ if } y_i > 0 \text{ and } y_{i+2} > 0, \text{ for } i \in [\![2, p-2]\!]; \\
\mathscr{A}(y, y+\mathbf{e}_i) & = \lambda_i \text{ if } y_{i-1} = 0 \text{ and } y_{i+1} = 0, \text{ for } i \in [\![2, p-2]\!]; \\
\mathscr{A}(y, y-\mathbf{e}_i) & = \lambda_{i+1} + \lambda_{i-1} \text{ if } y_i > 0 \text{ and } y_{i-2} = 0, \text{ for } i \in [\![p+1, 2p-3]\!]; \\
\mathscr{A}(y, y-\mathbf{e}_i) & = \lambda_{i+1} \text{ if } y_i > 0 \text{ and } y_{i-2} > 0, \text{ for } i \in [\![p+1, 2p-3]\!]; \\
\mathscr{A}(y, y+\mathbf{e}_i) & = \lambda_i \text{ if } y_{i+1} = 0 \text{ and } y_{i-1} = 0, \text{ for } i \in [\![p+1, 2p-3]\!]; \\
\mathscr{A}(y, y-\mathbf{e}_{p-1}) & = \lambda_{p-2} + \lambda_p \text{ if } y_{p-1} > 0; \\
\mathscr{A}(y, y+\mathbf{e}_{p-1}) & = \lambda_{p-1} \text{ if } y_{p-2} = 0 \text{ and } y_p = 0; \\
\mathscr{A}(y, y-\mathbf{e}_p) & = \lambda_{p-1} + \lambda_{p+1} \text{ if } y_p > 0; \\
\mathscr{A}(y, y+\mathbf{e}_p) & = \lambda_p \text{ if } y_{p-1} = 0 \text{ and } y_{p+1} = 0; \\
\mathscr{A}(y, z) & = 0 \text{ otherwise.}
\end{cases}
$$

The explicit computation of the stationary distribution π in this case seems out of reach. Nevertheless, we can bound the associated marginal process χ from below and from above, employing sample-path stochastic order, by reversible CTMC's, for which the stationary distributions can be easily derived. This leads to bounds for the stationary distribution $\pi(\cdot)$, and in turn, for the trajectories of the fluid limits.

First, using an upper stochastic-order bound for χ, we obtain the following result.

LEMMA 3. *For G the $(2p+1)$-cycle, Φ the priority policy depicted in Figure 5 and an arrival-rate vector λ satisfying (34), the marginal process χ corresponding to nodes $\{1,\dots,2p-2\}$ is ergodic.*

PROOF. We use the $\mathbb{E}_{2p-2}$-valued CTMC $\overline{\chi}$ having the following generator $\overline{\mathscr{A}}$ as a sample-path stochastic order bound. For any $y \in \mathbb{E}_{2p-2}$,

$$\begin{cases} \overline{\mathscr{A}}(y, y-\mathbf{e}_1) & = \lambda_{2p-1} \text{ if } y_1 > 0 \text{ and } y_3 = 0; \\ \overline{\mathscr{A}}(y, y-\mathbf{e}_{2p-2}) & = \lambda_{2p} \text{ if } y_{2p-2} > 0 \text{ and } y_{2p-4} = 0; \\ \overline{\mathscr{A}}(y, y-\mathbf{e}_i) & = \lambda_{i-1} \text{ if } y_i > 0 \text{ and } y_{i+2} = 0, \text{ for } i \in [\![2, p-2]\!]; \\ \overline{\mathscr{A}}(y, y-\mathbf{e}_i) & = \lambda_{i+1} \text{ if } y_i > 0 \text{ and } y_{i-2} = 0, \text{ for } i \in [\![p+1, 2p-3]\!]; \\ \overline{\mathscr{A}}(y, z) & = \mathscr{A}(y, z) \text{ in all other cases.} \end{cases}$$

Observe that the two (irreducible) CTMC's χ and $\overline{\chi}$ have same up rates, but some down rates of χ are larger than the corresponding ones of $\overline{\chi}$. Thus, if $\chi(0) = \overline{\chi}(0)$, then $\chi \leq_{st} \overline{\chi}$. Simple algebra shows that, for any λ satisfying (34), the process $\overline{\chi}$ is reversible, with stationary probability $\overline{\pi}$ defined, for $y \in \mathbb{E}_{2p-2}$, by

$$\overline{\pi}(y) = \overline{\alpha} \left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_{2p-1}}\right)^{y_1} \prod_{i \in [\![2,p-2]\!]} \left(\frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda_{i-1}}\right)^{y_i} \left(\frac{\lambda_{p-1}}{\lambda_{p-2}+\lambda_p}\right)^{y_{p-1}} \times \left(\frac{\lambda_p}{\lambda_{p-1}+\lambda_{p+1}}\right)^{y_p} \prod_{i \in [\![p+1,2p-3]\!]} \left(\frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda_{i+1}}\right)^{y_i} \left(\frac{\lambda_{2p-2}}{\lambda_{2p}}\right)^{y_{2p-2}},$$

where $\overline{\alpha}$ is the corresponding normalizing constant. Therefore, as stochastic order is preserved in the limit as $t \to \infty$, χ is also ergodic. □

COROLLARY 5. *The matching queue $(G, \lambda, \Phi)_{\text{C}}$ corresponding to Figure 5 and an intensity λ satisfying (34) can be stable only if*

$$\lambda_{2p+1} < \lambda_{2p-1} \left(\frac{\lambda_{2p-1}+\lambda_2-\lambda_1}{\lambda_{2p-1}+\lambda_2}\right) + \lambda_{2p} \left(\frac{\lambda_{2p}+\lambda_{2p-3}-\lambda_{2p-2}}{\lambda_{2p}+\lambda_{2p-3}}\right). \tag{35}$$

Moreover, we have the following strict inclusion,

$$\{\lambda \text{ satisfying (35)}\} \bigcap \text{NCOND}_{\text{C}}(G) \subsetneq \text{NCOND}_{\text{C}}(G). \tag{36}$$

PROOF. From Lemma 3, Assumption 2 holds so that Theorem 4 can be applied. From (20) and Corollary 2, a necessary condition for the system to be stable is given by

$$\lambda_{2p+1} < \lambda_{2p-1} \pi\Big(\mathcal{P}_{2p-1}(2p+1)\Big) + \lambda_{2p} \pi\Big(\mathcal{P}_{2p}(2p+1)\Big). \tag{37}$$

Consider now the $\mathbb{E}_{2p-2}$-valued CTMC $\underline{\chi}$ having the generator $\underline{\mathscr{A}}$ below. For any $y \in \mathbb{E}_{2p-2}$,

$$\begin{cases} \underline{\mathscr{A}}(y, y-\mathbf{e}_1) & = \lambda_{2p-1}+\lambda_2 \text{ if } y_1>0 \text{ and } y_3>0; \\ \underline{\mathscr{A}}(y, y-\mathbf{e}_{2p-2}) & = \lambda_{2p}+\lambda_{2p-3} \text{ if } y_{2p-2}>0 \text{ and } y_{2p-4}>0 \\ \underline{\mathscr{A}}(y, y-\mathbf{e}_i) & = \lambda_{i-1}+\lambda_{i+1} \text{ if } y_i>0 \text{ and } y_{i+2}>0, \text{ for } i \in [\![2, p-2]\!]; \\ \underline{\mathscr{A}}(y, y-\mathbf{e}_i) & = \lambda_{i+1}+\lambda_{i-1} \text{ if } y_i>0 \text{ and } y_{i-2}>0, \text{ for } i \in [\![p+1, 2p-3]\!]; \\ \underline{\mathscr{A}}(y, z) & = \mathscr{A}(y, z) \text{ in all other cases.} \end{cases}$$

As for the process $\overline{\chi}$ in the proof of Lemma 3, it can be checked that for any λ satisfying (34), $\underline{\chi}$ is reversible with a stationary probability $\underline{\pi}$, defined for $y \in \mathbb{E}_{2p-2}$, via

$$\begin{aligned} (38) \quad \underline{\pi}(y) = \underline{\alpha} & \left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_{2p-1}+\lambda_2}\right)^{y_1} \prod_{i \in [\![2,p-2]\!]} \left(\frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda_{i-1}+\lambda_{i+1}}\right)^{y_i} \left(\frac{\lambda_{p-1}}{\lambda_{p-2}+\lambda_p}\right)^{y_{p-1}} \\ & \times \left(\frac{\lambda_p}{\lambda_{p-1}+\lambda_{p+1}}\right)^{y_p} \prod_{i \in [\![p+1,2p-3]\!]} \left(\frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda_{i+1}+\lambda_{i-1}}\right)^{y_i} \left(\frac{\lambda_{2p-2}}{\lambda_{2p}+\lambda_{2p-3}}\right)^{y_{2p-2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\underline{\alpha}$ is the normalizing constant.

Let $\chi(\infty)$ and $\underline{\chi}(\infty)$ denote $\mathbb{E}_{2p-2}$-valued random variables having the distribution π and $\underline{\pi}$, respectively. The two CTMC's χ and $\underline{\chi}$ have same up rates, but some down rates of χ are smaller than the corresponding ones of $\underline{\chi}$, so that, if $\underline{\chi}(0) = \chi(0)$, then $\underline{\chi} \leq_{st} \chi$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} (39) \quad \pi\Big(\mathcal{P}_{2p-1}(2p+1)\Big) &= P(\chi_1(\infty)=0) \leq P\Big(\underline{\chi}_1(\infty)=0\Big) = \underline{\pi}\Big(\{0\} \times \mathbb{E}_{2p-3}\Big); \\ \pi\Big(\mathcal{P}_{2p}(2p+1)\Big) &= P(\chi_{2p-2}(\infty)=0) \leq P\Big(\underline{\chi}_{2p-2}(\infty)=0\Big) = \underline{\pi}\Big(\mathbb{E}_{2p-3} \times \{0\}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

The proof of (35) follow by Plugging (39) into (37), and computing the values of $\underline{\pi}(\{0\} \times \mathbb{E}_{2p-3})$ and $\underline{\pi}(\mathbb{E}_{2p-3} \times \{0\})$ from (38).

It remains to show that there exists an arrival-rate vector λ in $\text{NCOND}_{\text{C}}(G)$ violating (35). To that end, fix $0 < \epsilon < \frac{2p-2}{2p-1}$ and take $\eta = k\epsilon^2$ for some k such that $0 < \eta < \frac{\epsilon}{2p-2}$. Consider a λ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_{2p+1} & = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{p-\frac{1}{2}}{2p-2}\epsilon; \\ \lambda_{2p-1} & = \lambda_{2p} = \frac{1}{4} - \frac{p-\frac{3}{2}}{2(2p-2)}\epsilon; \\ \lambda_i & = \lambda_{2p-(i+1)} = \frac{\epsilon}{2p-2} - (i-1)\eta; \; i \in [\![1, p-1]\!]. \end{cases}$$



FIG 6. *An intensity in* NCOND *rendering the system unstable.*

Note that λ satisfies (34). Then for the η defined above, there exist two real numbers k' and k'', such that

$$\lambda_{2p+1}\left(\lambda_{2p-1}+\lambda_2\right) = \frac{1}{8} - \frac{\epsilon}{4} + \frac{\epsilon}{2(2p-2)} + k'\epsilon^2 \quad \text{and}$$

$$2\lambda_{2p-1}\left(\lambda_{2p-1}+\lambda_2-\lambda_1\right) = \frac{1}{8} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{p-\frac{3}{2}}{2p-2}\epsilon + k''\epsilon^2 = \frac{1}{8} - \frac{\epsilon}{4} + \frac{\epsilon}{4(2p-2)} + k''\epsilon^2.$$

Therefore, for ϵ small enough,

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_{2p+1} &> 2\lambda_{2p-1}\left(\frac{\lambda_{2p-1}+\lambda_2-\lambda_1}{\lambda_{2p-1}+\lambda_2}\right)\\ &= \lambda_{2p-1}\left(\frac{\lambda_{2p-1}+\lambda_2-\lambda_1}{\lambda_{2p-1}+\lambda_2}\right) + \lambda_{2p}\left(\frac{\lambda_{2p}+\lambda_{2p-3}-\lambda_{2p-2}}{\lambda_{2p}+\lambda_{2p-3}}\right).\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. □

6. Proof of The Main Result. In this section we prove Theorem 3, after introducing several key auxiliary results.

6.1. *Graphs Induced By Separable Graphs.* We start by proving the connection between separable graphs and the graphs investigated in Section 5.

LEMMA 4. *For any connected graph G,*

(i) If G is non-bipartite and non-separable, then it induces a pendant graph or an odd cycle of size 5 or more.

(ii) If G is separable, then it does not induce a pendant graph, nor any odd cycle of size 5 or more.

PROOF. **Proof of** (i)**.** Let G be a non-bipartite and non-separable graph. It is a classical result of graph theory (see *e.g.* Theorem 13.2.1 of [20]) that G contains an odd cycle $\breve{G}$ as a subgraph. We consider two cases separately: $\breve{G}$ is a triangle, or $\breve{G}$ is of size 5 or more.

Case 1. Assume that $\breve{G}$ is a triangle. It is not possible that $\breve{G} = G$, because then G would be a complete graph, and thereby a separable graph. Thus G has other nodes, in addition to the three ones of $\breve{G}$.

We prove the claim by induction. Assume that G induces a graph $\bar{G}$ that consists of a separable graph $\breve{G}$ of order $q \geq 3$, connected to another node, which we denote as node i. We have the following four alternatives, which are depicted in an example in Figure 7.

(a) There may exist two independent sets $\mathcal{I}_1$ and $\mathcal{I}_2$ of $\breve{G}$, and two nodes $i_1 \in \mathcal{I}_1$ and $i_2 \in \mathcal{I}_2$, such that $i \not- i_1$ and $i \not- i_2$. In that case, as $\breve{G}$ is of order 3 or more, there exist an independent set $\mathcal{I}_3$, which is different from $\mathcal{I}_1$ and $\mathcal{I}_2$, and a node $i_3 \in \mathcal{I}_3$, such that $i - i_3$. Then $\bar{G}$ induces the Pendant graph $i - i_3 - i_1 - i_2$, where i is only adjacent to i_3 and (i_1, i_2, i_3) form a triangle. In particular, G induces a pendant graph.

(b) There may exist an independent set $\mathcal{I}_1$ of $\breve{G}$ such that $i - k$ for any $k \in \breve{G} \setminus \mathcal{I}_1$, and $i \not- i_1$ for any $i_1 \in \mathcal{I}_1$. Then $\bar{G}$ is again a separable graph of order q, having the same maximal independent sets as $\breve{G}$, except that $\mathcal{I}_1$ is replaced by $\mathcal{I}_1 \cup \{i\}$.

(c) There may exist an independent set $\mathcal{I}_1$ of $\breve{G}$ such that $i - k$ for any $k \in \breve{G} \setminus \mathcal{I}_1$, and$i \not- i_1$ for some (not necessarily unique) $i_1 \in \mathcal{I}_1$ and $i - j_1$ for some (again, not necessarily unique) $j_1 \in \mathcal{I}_1$. In that case, $\bar{G}$ induces the pendant graph $i_1 - i_2 - j_1 - i$, where i_1 is only adjacent to i_2 and (i_2, j_1, i) form a triangle.

(d) We may have $i - j$ for any node $j \in \breve{G}$. Then $\bar{G}$ is a separable graph of order $q + 1$ whose maximal independent sets are those of $\breve{G}$, plus the independent set $\mathcal{I}_{q+1} := \{i\}$.

To summarize, in cases (a) and (c), $\bar{G}$ and therefore G, induce a pendant graph. In cases (b) and (d) $\bar{G}$ is separable, and we cannot have $G = \bar{G}$. Thus there exists another node in G that is connected to $\bar{G}$, and we can re-iterate the same procedure for $\breve{G} \equiv \bar{G}$. Eventually, some $\bar{G}$ induced in G will exhibit

either case (a) or (c), otherwise G would be separable. This concludes the proof in this first case.



FIG 7. *Completing a separable graph with one node always yields to a separable graph ((b) and (d)), or a non-separable graph inducing a pendant graph ((a) and (c)).*

Case 2. Now assume that $\breve{G}$ is of length 5 or more. Assume that G does not induce $\breve{G}$. Therefore G admits an edge (i, j), where i and j are two nodes of $\breve{G}$. But drawing an edge inside an odd cycle always creates an odd cycle and an even cycle (see Figure 8).



FIG 8. *Drawing an edge between two nodes of an odd cycle creates an odd cycle.*

By induction on the added edges, $\breve{G}$ finally induces an odd cycle of length $2p + 1 \geq 3$. If $2p + 1 \geq 5$, we are done. If $2p + 1 = 3$, we are back in case 1.

Proof of (ii)**.** We prove the result by contradiction. Let G be a separable graph of order q and let $\mathcal{I}_1, ..., \mathcal{I}_q$ be its disjoint maximal independent sets. Then for any two nodes i, j of G, the relation $i \not\sim j$ implies that i and j belong to the same independent set $\mathcal{I}_k$, for some $k \in [\![1, q]\!]$, but to no other independent set.

First take the contradictory assumption that G induces a pendant graph $\breve{G}$, and label the nodes of $\breve{G}$ as in Figure 2. Suppose that $3 \in \mathcal{I}_i$. All the neighbors of 3 in $\breve{G}$ (and thus in G) cannot be in $\mathcal{I}_i$, so that, there exist $j, k, \ell \in [\![1, q]\!] \setminus \{i\}$, such that $4 \in \mathcal{I}_j$, $1 \in \mathcal{I}_k$ and $2 \in \mathcal{I}_\ell$. As $4 \not\sim 1$, we have $j = k$. Similarly, we have $j = \ell$, and thus $k = \ell$. But, since $1 - 2$, nodes 1 and 2 do not belong to the same independent set - a contradiction. There, G cannot induce a pendant graph.

We next assume that G induces the $2p + 1$-cycle $\breve{G}$, with $p \geq 2$ (so that $q \leq 2p + 1$). For simplicity, label the nodes of $\breve{G}$ as 1,2,...,$2p + 1$, in a way that

$$1 - 2 - 3 - ... - 2p - (2p + 1) - 1.$$

For all $j \in [\![1, 2p + 1]\!]$, let i_j be such that $j \in \mathcal{I}_{i_j}$. As $1 - 2$, $2 - 3$ and $3 \not\sim 1$, we have $i_1 \neq i_2$ and $i_1 = i_3$. In general, we see that any odd node k is in $\mathcal{I}_{i_1}$, whereas any even node ℓ is in $\mathcal{I}_{i_2}$. It follows that nodes 1 and $2p + 1$ both belong to $\mathcal{I}_{i_1}$, but since $(2p + 1) - 1$ we again arrive at a contradiction, implying that G cannot induce an odd cycle of size 5 or more. □

6.2. *Non-chaoticity of Matching Queues.* As was already discussed, Theorem 3 is proved by employing Lemma 4, after showing that the pendant graph and any odd-cycle of size 5 or more can be unstable, even if NCOND holds. However, if $\breve{G} = (\breve{\mathcal{V}}, \breve{\mathcal{E}})$ is induced in $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, and if we assume that i_0 is an unstable node of a matching queue on $\breve{G}$ when it is considered in isolation, then it might not be unstable in a matching queue on G. (In our case, $\breve{G}$ is either the pendant graph of an odd cycle.) Therefore, to construct an unstable matching queue on G itself, we must show that the effect of the arrivals to $\mathcal{V} \setminus \breve{\mathcal{V}}$ can be controlled so that node i_0 remains unstable in the matching queue on G. If we think of the effect of the arrivals of items of $\mathcal{V} \setminus \breve{\mathcal{V}}$, as a perturbation of the number of items in the matching queue on $\breve{G}$ when considered in isolation, then we must show that perturbations of the matching queue on $\breve{G}$ do not get amplified within the matching queue on G. We refer to such a property as *non-chaoticity* of matching queues. See Lemma 6 below for the precise statement.

To prove this non-chaoticity property, we first prove an auxiliary result.

Let $\|.\|$ denote the 1-norm on $\mathbb{R}^p$, $p \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$, i.e., for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$,

$$\|x\| = \sum_{i=1}^{p} |x_i|.$$

We say that two matching queues $(G, \lambda, \Phi)_{\mathrm{C}}$ and $(G', \lambda', \Phi')_{\mathrm{C}}$ such that $|\mathcal{V}| = |\mathcal{V}'|$ and $\lambda = \lambda'$ have *the same input*, if both are constructed using the same $|\mathcal{V}|$ Poisson processes (same sample paths of the arrival process).

LEMMA 5. *Let $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ be a connected graph, λ an arrival-rate vector in $\mathbb{R}_{++}^{|\mathcal{V}|}$, and Φ a priority matching policy on G. Consider the matching queue $(G, \lambda, \Phi)_{\mathrm{C}}$ and the associated queue process Q. Let x and y be two elements in the state space $\mathbb{G}$ of Q, and denote by Q^x and Q^y the buffer content processes of the two models having initial values x and y, respectively, and having the same input. Then for any $t \geq 0$,*

$$\|Q^x(t) - Q^y(t)\| \leq \|x - y\|.$$

We remark that the Lipschitz-continuity property stated above follows (as will become clear in the proof) from a specific property of the DTMC embedded in arrival-time epoches, known as *non-expensiveness* in the literature on stochastic recursions; see, e.g., Section 2.11 in [3].

PROOF OF LEMMA 5. Let $T_1 < T_2 < ...$ be the arrival times of elements to the system. With some abuse of notation, denote for the time being, $Q^x(0) = x$, $Q^y(0) = y$, and for all $n \geq 1$, $Q^x(n) := Q^x(T_n)$ and $Q^y(n) := Q^y(T_n)$. Since both processes Q^x and Q^y are constant between arrival times, it suffices to show the result at any time T_n. We reason by induction. Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and assume that

$$\|Q^x(n) - Q^y(n)\| \leq \|x - y\|.$$

Let j be the class of the item drawn at time T_n. We have the following alternatives:

1. Assume that the new item is matched in both systems, with an item of the same class $k \in \mathcal{E}(j)$ (in which case, both $Q_k^x(n)$ and $Q_k^y(n)$ are positive). We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|Q^x(n+1) - Q^y(n+1)\| \\
&\quad = \|Q^x(n) - Q^y(n)\| - \left|Q_k^x(n) - Q_k^y(n)\right| + \left|(Q_k^x(n) - 1) - \left(Q_k^y(n) - 1\right)\right| \\
&\quad = \|Q^x(n) - Q^y(n)\|.
\end{aligned}$$

2. Assume that the new item is matched with k_x (respectively, k_y) in the system initiated by x (respectively, by y), where $k_x \neq k_y$. Then, by the definition of a priority policy, we must have that $\left(\left(Q^x_{k_x}(n) > 0\right) \text{ and } \left(Q^y_{k_x}(n) = 0\right)\right)$ or $\left(\left(Q^x_{k_y}(n) = 0\right) \text{ and } \left(Q^y_{k_y}(n) > 0\right)\right)$ (or both), since otherwise, the new arrival of class j would be matched with the same item in both systems.
   Assume that we are in the first case, the other one is symmetric. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\| Q^x(n+1) - Q^y(n+1) \| \\
&= \|Q^x(n) - Q^y(n)\| - \left|Q^x_{k_x}(n) - Q^y_{k_x}(n)\right| + \left|\left(Q^x_{k_x}(n) - 1\right) - Q^y_{k_x}(n)\right| \\
&\quad - \left|Q^x_{k_y}(n) - Q^y_{k_y}(n)\right| + \left|\left(Q^y_{k_y}(n) - 1\right) - Q^x_{k_y}(n)\right| \\
&\leq \| Q^x(n) - Q^y(n) \| - Q^x_{k_x}(n) + \left(Q^x_{k_x}(n) - 1\right) - \left|Q^x_{k_y}(n) - Q^y_{k_y}(n)\right| \\
&\quad + \left|Q^y_{k_y}(n) - Q^x_{k_y}(n)\right| + 1 \\
&= \| Q^x(n) - Q^y(n) \| .
\end{aligned}$$

3. Assume that the new arrival to class j is matched in the system initiated by x, say, with $k_x \in \mathcal{E}(j)$, but not in the one initiated by y (the other way around is symmetric). Then we must have $Q^y_{k_x} = 0$ and in turn,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|Q^x(n+1) - Q^y(n+1)\| \\
&= \|Q^x(n) - Q^y(n)\| - \left|Q^x_{k_x}(n) - Q^y_{k_x}(n)\right| + \left|\left(Q^x_{k_x}(n) - 1\right) - Q^y_{k_x}(n)\right| \\
&\quad - \left|Q^x_j(n) - Q^y_j(n)\right| + \left|\left(Q^y_j(n) - 1\right) - Q^x_j(n)\right| \\
&\leq \|Q^x(n) - Q^y(n)\| - Q^x_{k_x}(n) + \left(Q^x_{k_x}(n) - 1\right) - \left|Q^y_j(n) - Q^x_j(n)\right| \\
&\quad + \left|Q^y_j(n) - Q^x_j(n)\right| + 1 \\
&= \|Q^x(n) - Q^y(n)\|.
\end{aligned}$$

4. Finally, assume that $Q^x_k(n) = Q^y_k(n) = 0$ for any $k \in \mathcal{E}(j)$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|Q^x(n+1) - Q^y(n+1)\| \\
&= \|Q^x(n) - Q^y(n)\| - \left|Q^x_j(n) - Q^y_j(n)\right| + \left|\left(Q^x_j(n) - 1\right) - \left(Q^y_j(n) - 1\right)\right| \\
&= \|Q^x(n) - Q^y(n)\|.
\end{aligned}$$

□

LEMMA 6. *Consider a matching queue* $\Sigma := (G, \lambda, \Phi)_{\mathrm{C}}$, *where* $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ *and* Φ *is of the priority type. Let* $\breve{\mathcal{V}}$ *and* $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ *be a partition of* $\mathcal{V}$, *and let* $\breve{G} = (\breve{\mathcal{V}}, \breve{\mathcal{E}})$ *and* $\hat{G} = (\hat{\mathcal{V}}, \hat{\mathcal{E}})$ *be the graphs induced respectively by* $\breve{\mathcal{V}}$ *and* $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ *in* G. *Consider the matching queue* $\tilde{\Sigma} := (\tilde{G}, \lambda, \tilde{\Phi})_{\mathrm{C}}$, *where the graph* $\tilde{G}$ *is disconnected and obtained from* G *after erasing all the edges in* $\breve{\mathcal{V}} \times \hat{\mathcal{V}}$, *and the priority-type matching policy* $\tilde{\Phi}$ *is such that the restrictions of* Φ *and* $\tilde{\Phi}$ *on* $\breve{G}$ *coincide. If* Σ *and* $\tilde{\Sigma}$ *have the same input, then their respective queue processes* Q *and* $\tilde{Q}$ *satisfy*

$$\sum_{i \in \breve{\mathcal{V}}} \left| Q_i(t) - \tilde{Q}_i(t) \right| \leq \hat{N}(t), \quad t \geq 0,$$

where $\hat{N}(t)$ *is the number of arrivals of items to* $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ *up to* t.



FIG 9. *Right, the modified disconnected graph* $\tilde{G}$, *if* $\breve{G}$ *is the "N" graph.*

PROOF. Let $\hat{T}_n, n \geq 1$ be the points of $\hat{N}$ (*i.e.* the arrival times of elements of $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$). Let us also denote $\hat{U}_0 = 0$ and for all $n \geq 0$,

$$\hat{U}_{n+1} = \inf \left\{ t \geq \hat{U}_n; \text{ a matching occurs at } t \text{ in } \Sigma \text{ between an element of } \breve{\mathcal{V}} \text{ and one of } \hat{\mathcal{V}} \right\}.$$

Notice that the times $\hat{U}_n$, $n \geq 1$ can either coincide with points of $\hat{N}$, or with arrival times of elements of $\breve{G}$ that are matched with an element of $\hat{G}$ in Σ.

Let $n \geq 0$. In the time interval $\left(\hat{U}_n, \hat{U}_{n+1}\right)$, the restrictions to $\breve{G}$ of Σ and of $\tilde{\Sigma}$ both behave exactly as the matching queue $\left(\breve{G}, \lambda_{\breve{\mathcal{V}}}, \breve{\Phi}\right)_{\mathrm{C}}$, where $\breve{\Phi}$ is the restriction of Φ and $\tilde{\Phi}$ to $\breve{G}$. Therefore we can apply Lemma 5 to the latter model and to the initial conditions $Q_{\breve{\mathcal{V}}}\left(\hat{U}_{n+1}^-\right)$ and $\tilde{Q}_{\breve{\mathcal{V}}}\left(\hat{U}_{n+1}^-\right)$, where we recall that $X\left(t^-\right)$ denotes the left-limit of X at t. We conclude that for any $n \geq 0$,

$$\sum_{i \in \breve{\mathcal{V}}} \left| Q_i\left(\hat{U}_{n+1}^-\right) - \tilde{Q}_i\left(\hat{U}_{n+1}^-\right) \right| \leq \sum_{i \in \breve{\mathcal{V}}} \left| Q_i\left(\hat{U}_n\right) - \tilde{Q}_i\left(\hat{U}_n\right) \right|. \tag{40}$$

Further, at $\hat{U}_{n+1}$ we only have two possibilities:

- If $\hat{U}_{n+1}$ is an arrival time of an element of $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ (it coincides with some $\hat{T}_k$), one item (say, of class $j \in \breve{\mathcal{V}}$) of the buffer content of Σ restricted to $\breve{\mathcal{V}}$ leaves the system , but the restriction of $\tilde{\Sigma}$ to $\breve{\mathcal{V}}$ does not change, in which case

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{i\in\breve{\mathcal{V}}}\left|Q_i\left(\hat{U}_{n+1}\right)-\tilde{Q}_i\left(\hat{U}_{n+1}\right)\right|\\&=\sum_{i\in\breve{\mathcal{V}}}\left|Q_i\left(\hat{U}^-_{n+1}\right)-\tilde{Q}_i\left(\hat{U}^-_{n+1}\right)\right|-\left|Q_j\left(\hat{U}^-_{n+1}\right)-\tilde{Q}_j\left(\hat{U}^-_{n+1}\right)\right|\\&\qquad\qquad+\left|Q_j\left(\hat{U}^-_{n+1}\right)-1-\tilde{Q}_j\left(\hat{U}^-_{n+1}\right)\right|.\end{aligned}$$

- If $\hat{U}_{n+1}$ is an arrival time of an item of class $j \in \breve{\mathcal{V}}$ that is matched right away with an element of $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ in Σ, then the buffer content of Σ restricted to $\breve{\mathcal{V}}$ does not evolve, but that of $\tilde{\Sigma}$ does: if the new item is matched in $\tilde{\Sigma}$ with an element $k \in \mathcal{E}(j) \cap \breve{\mathcal{V}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{i\in\breve{\mathcal{V}}}\left|Q_i\left(\hat{U}_{n+1}\right)-\tilde{Q}_i\left(\hat{U}_{n+1}\right)\right|\\&=\sum_{i\in\breve{\mathcal{V}}}\left|Q_i\left(\hat{U}^-_{n+1}\right)-\tilde{Q}_i\left(\hat{U}^-_{n+1}\right)\right|-\left|Q_k\left(\hat{U}^-_{n+1}\right)-\tilde{Q}_k\left(\hat{U}^-_{n+1}\right)\right|\\&\qquad\qquad+\left|\tilde{Q}_k\left(\hat{U}^-_{n+1}\right)-1-Q_k\left(\hat{U}^-_{n+1}\right)\right|.\end{aligned}$$

  Finally, if the new item does not find a match in $\breve{\mathcal{V}}$ in $\tilde{\Sigma}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{i\in\breve{\mathcal{V}}}\left|Q_i\left(\hat{U}_{n+1}\right)-\tilde{Q}_i\left(\hat{U}_{n+1}\right)\right|\\&=\sum_{i\in\breve{\mathcal{V}}}\left|Q_i\left(\hat{U}^-_{n+1}\right)-\tilde{Q}_i\left(\hat{U}^-_{n+1}\right)\right|-\left|Q_j\left(\hat{U}^-_{n+1}\right)-\tilde{Q}_j\left(\hat{U}^-_{n+1}\right)\right|\\&\qquad\qquad+\left|\tilde{Q}_j\left(\hat{U}^-_{n+1}\right)+1-Q_j\left(\hat{U}^-_{n+1}\right)\right|.\end{aligned}$$

In all cases, we obtain that

$$\sum_{i\in\breve{\mathcal{V}}}\left|Q_i\left(\hat{U}_{n+1}\right)-\tilde{Q}_i\left(\hat{U}_{n+1}\right)\right|\leq\sum_{i\in\breve{G}}\left|Q_i\left(\hat{U}^-_{n+1}\right)-\tilde{Q}_i\left(\hat{U}^-_{n+1}\right)\right|+1. \tag{41}$$

Finally, gathering (40) and (41), as $Q(0)$ and $\tilde{Q}(0)$ coincide, we obtain that for any $t \geq 0$,

$$\sum_{i\in\breve{\mathcal{V}}}\left|Q_i\left(t\right)-\tilde{Q}_i\left(t\right)\right|\leq\sum_{n\geq 1}\mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{U}_n\leq t\}}. \tag{42}$$

It remains to assess the latter sum. As previously mentioned, the $\hat{U}_n$, $n \geq 1$, either coincide with an instant $\hat{T}_k$ in which the arrived element of $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ is matched upon arrival, or with instants in which a previously arrived and unmatched element of $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ is finally matched. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{n\geq 1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{U}_n \leq t\}} &= \sum_{n\geq 1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{T}_n \leq t \text{ and the item drawn at } \hat{T}_n \text{ is matched with an item of } \breve{\mathcal{V}} \text{ before } t\}} \\ &\leq \sum_{n\geq 1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{T}_n \leq t\}},\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (42), concludes the proof. □

6.3. *Proof of Theorem 3.* We are now in position to prove Theorem 3. The strategy is the following: In Lemma 4 we have shown that non-bipartite connected graphs induce particular type of graphs, for which the corresponding matching queues $(G, \lambda, \Phi)_{\mathrm{C}}$ are proved to be possibly unstable for some $\lambda \in \textsc{Ncond}_{\mathrm{C}}(G)$ and some matching policy Φ (Sections 5.1 and 5.3). The instability of the matching queue under consideration can then be deduced from the non-chaoticity property in Lemma 6.

Proof of Theorem 3. Let $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ be a connected non-bipartite graph. By Lemma 4, G induces a pendant graph or an odd cycle of size 5 or more. Let $\breve{G} = (\breve{\mathcal{V}}, \breve{\mathcal{E}})$ be that induced subgraph. Then there exists an arrival-rate vector $\breve{\lambda} \in (\mathbb{R}_{++})^{|\breve{\mathcal{V}}|}$ and a matching policy $\breve{\Phi}$, such that the matching queue $\left(\breve{G}, \breve{\lambda}, \breve{\Phi}\right)_{\mathrm{C}}$ is unstable, whereas $\breve{\lambda} \in \textsc{Ncond}_{\mathrm{C}}(\breve{G})$. That latter claim follows from Corollary 3 when $\breve{G}$ is a pendant graph, and from Corollary 5 if $\breve{G}$ is an odd cycle. We fix the latter $\breve{\lambda}$ until the end of the proof and set (recall (2))

$$\tau := \min\left\{\overline{\breve{\lambda}}_{\breve{\mathcal{E}}(\breve{\mathcal{I}})} - \overline{\breve{\lambda}}_{\breve{\mathcal{I}}} : \breve{\mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{I}(\breve{G})\right\}. \tag{43}$$

Let $\hat{G} = G \setminus \breve{G}$ and denote $\hat{G} = \left(\hat{\mathcal{V}}, \hat{\mathcal{E}}\right)$. In view of Proposition 1 and Lemma 3, there exists a node $i_0 \in \breve{V}$ ($i_0 = 4$ if $\breve{G}$ is the pendant graph and $i_0 = 2p+1$ if $\breve{G}$ is a $2p+1$-cycle) and a measure $\breve{\pi}$ (on $\mathbb{E}_2$ for the pendant graph, and $\mathbb{E}_{2p-2}$ for the $2p+1$-cycle) such that the drift of the i_0-coordinate of the fluid limit reads

$$\beta := \breve{\lambda}_{i_0} - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}(i_0)} \breve{\lambda}_j \breve{\pi}\left(\mathcal{P}_j(i_0)\right) > 0. \tag{44}$$

Set $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}(\tau \wedge \beta)$, and let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^{|\mathcal{V}|}$ satisfy

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_{\breve{\mathcal{V}}} & = \breve{\lambda}; \\ \bar{\lambda}_{\hat{\mathcal{V}}} & \leq \gamma. \end{cases} \tag{45}$$

We first prove that $\lambda \in \textsc{Ncond}_{\textsc{c}}(G)$. For $\mathcal{I} \in \mathbb{I}(G)$, observe that

$$\breve{\mathcal{E}}\left(\mathcal{I} \cap \breve{\mathcal{V}}\right) \cup \hat{\mathcal{E}}\left(\mathcal{I} \cap \hat{\mathcal{V}}\right) \subset \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{I}).$$

Therefore,

$$\bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{I})} - \bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}} \geq \bar{\lambda}_{\breve{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{I}\cap\breve{\mathcal{V}})} + \bar{\lambda}_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{I}\cap\hat{\mathcal{V}})} - \bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}\cap\breve{\mathcal{V}}} - \bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}\cap\hat{\mathcal{V}}}. \tag{46}$$

First, as $\breve{G}$ is induced in G, $\mathcal{I} \cap \breve{\mathcal{V}} \in \mathbb{I}(\breve{G})$. Thus, (43) implies that

$$\bar{\lambda}_{\breve{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{I}\cap\breve{\mathcal{V}})} - \bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}\cap\breve{\mathcal{V}}} > \gamma.$$

Moreover, from (45) we clearly have that

$$\bar{\lambda}_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{I}\cap\hat{\mathcal{V}})} - \bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}\cap\hat{\mathcal{V}}} \geq -\gamma.$$

These two observations, together with (46), yield $\bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{I})} - \bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}} > 0$. Therefore $\lambda \in \textsc{Ncond}_{\textsc{c}}(G)$.

It remains to construct a matching policy Φ on G rendering the matching queue $(G, \lambda, \Phi)_{\textsc{c}}$ unstable. To this end, it suffices to consider any Φ whose restriction to $\breve{G}$ is $\breve{\Phi}$. Consider the process $\tilde{Q}$ constructed in Lemma 6, consisting in the queue content of the elements of $\breve{G}$ when one erases the edges of $\breve{\mathcal{V}} \times \hat{\mathcal{V}}$. It follows from Lemma 6 that

$$Q_{i_0} \geq_{st} \tilde{Q}_{i_0} - \hat{N}, \tag{47}$$

where $\hat{N}$ denotes again the arrival process of items of class in $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$. For $n \geq 1$, let $\hat{N}^n$ be a Poisson process with intensity $n\lambda_{\hat{\mathcal{V}}}$. Then, for any initial condition $\breve{Q}^n_{i_0}(0) = nx$, the following convergence holds in $\mathbb{D}^{|\breve{\mathcal{V}}|}$,

$$\left(\frac{1}{n}\breve{Q}^n(t) - \frac{1}{n}\hat{N}^n(t)e_{i_0},\, t \geq 0\right) \Rightarrow \left(\left(x + \breve{\lambda}_{i_0} - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}(i_0)} \breve{\lambda}_j \breve{\pi}\left(\mathcal{P}_j(i_0)\right) - \lambda_{\hat{\mathcal{V}}}\right) t.\mathbf{e}_{i_0},\, t \geq 0\right).$$

Together with (44) and (45), the above convergence implies that the Markov process $\breve{Q} - \hat{N}\mathbf{e}_{i_0}$ is transient, so that $\breve{Q}_{i_0} - \hat{N} \Rightarrow \infty$ as $t \to \infty$.

Finally, observe that, by definition, $\tilde{Q}$ has the same distribution as $\breve{Q}$. Thus, the $\mathbb{Z}_+^{|\mathcal{V}|}$-valued Markov process $\tilde{Q} - \hat{N}\mathbf{e}_{i_0}$ is transient and its i_0-coordinate converges in distribution to ∞ as $t \to \infty$. By (47), this is also the case for the i_0-coordinate of Q, so that Q is transient. □

7. Proof of the FWLLN. Our proof of the FWLLN will follow the pre-compactness approach [4, 33]. In particular, we will show that $\{\bar{Q}^n : n \geq 1\}$ is tight in $\mathbb{D}^{|\mathcal{V}|}$ and uniquely characterize the limit. However, it is useful to observe that, despite (18), we cannot consider S^n directly without any scaling because the *unscaled* process S^n is not tight in $\mathbb{D}^{|\mathcal{S}|}$. Indeed, (18) implies that the number of jumps of S^n is of order n over any finite interval, so that the number of discontinuities of S^n over any finite time interval increases to infinity with probability that converges to 1 as $n \to \infty$. Thus, there can be no limit of S^n in $\mathbb{D}^{|\mathcal{S}|}$.

To facilitate the notation, throughout this Section we let $\mathbb{E}$ be the state space of S^n. Let $\mathcal{M} := \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L})$ denote the space of (finite) measures on the space $\mathcal{L} := [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{E}$ such that $\mu([0, t] \times \mathbb{E}) = t$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ and $t > 0$, endowed with the Prohorov metric [4]. Next, define a sequence of random elements $\{\nu^n : n \geq 1\} \subset \mathcal{M}$ via

$$\nu^n([0, t] \times \mathcal{Z}) := \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{Z}}(S^n(u-))du, \quad t \geq 0, \quad \mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathbb{E}. \tag{48}$$

LEMMA 7. *If $\bar{Q}^n(0)$ is tight in $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}|}$, then $\{(\bar{Q}^n, \nu^n) : n \geq 1\}$ is tight in $\mathbb{D}^{|\mathcal{V}|}[0, \rho) \times \mathcal{M}$. Moreover, for any limit point $(\bar{Q}, \nu)$,*

$$\nu\left([0, t] \times \mathcal{Z}\right) = \int_0^t p_u(\mathcal{Z})\, du; \quad 0 \leq t \leq \rho, \ \mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathbb{E} \tag{49}$$

for some family of probability measures $\{p_u : 0 \leq u \leq t\}$ on $\mathbb{E}$.

PROOF. Tightness of the vector $\{(\bar{Q}^n, \nu^n) : n \geq 1\}$ follows from the tightness of each component separately; e.g., Theorem 11.6.7 in [33]. Tightness of $\{\nu^n : n \geq 1\}$ in $\mathcal{M}$ follows easily from the ergodicity of χ. Indeed, it follows from (17) and (18) that, for any compact set $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathbb{E}$,

$$\begin{aligned} E[\nu^n([0, t] \times \mathcal{Z})] &= E\left[\int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{Z}}(S^n(u-))du\right] \\ &= E\left[\int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\chi^n(u-))du\right] \\ &= E\left[\frac{1}{n}\int_0^{nt} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\chi(u-))du\right] \\ &\to P(\chi(\infty) \in \mathcal{Z})t \\ &= \pi(\mathcal{Z})t. \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

The limit in (50) holds as $n \to \infty$ and follows from the ergodic theorem (applied to χ) and the bounded convergence theorem. Since χ is ergodic, $\chi(\infty)$ is a proper random variable, namely, $\pi(\mathbb{E}) = 1$.

Take $\epsilon > 0$ and $t > 0$. Observe that, for any finite N and all $n \leq N$, the right-hand side of the second equality in (50) implies that for large-enough $c \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and for $K_c := [0, c]^{|\mathcal{S}|}$, it holds that $E[\nu^n([0, t] \times K_c)] \geq (1 - \epsilon)t$. The limit in (50) shows that this latter inequality holds for all n, i.e., we have

$$\inf_n E[\nu^n([0, t] \times K_c)] \geq (1 - \epsilon)t,$$

for a sufficiently large c. Hence, tightness of $\{\nu^n : n \geq 1\}$ follows from Lemma 1.3 in [19]. The fact that any limit point of this tight sequence has the form in (49) follows from Lemma 1.4 in [19].

We next show that $\{\bar{Q}^n : n \geq 1\}$ is $\mathbb{C}$-tight in $\mathbb{D}^{|\mathcal{V}|}$, i.e., it is tight and any of its limit points is continuous. We first note that, since all the jumps in $\bar{Q}^n$ are of size $1/n$, and are thus converging to 0 as $n \to \infty$, we can work with the modulus of continuity (e.g., p. 123 in [4])

$$w(y, \eta, T) := \sup\Big\{ |y(t_2) - y(t_1)| : 0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq T,\ |t_2 - t_1| \leq \eta \Big\},\ \eta > 0,\ T > 0.$$

Hence, we can establish the result by applying Theorem 11.6.3 in p. 389 in [33]. Conditions (6.3) in that theorem, namely, tightness of $\{\bar{Q}^n(0) : n \geq 1\}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}|}$ is assumed. To show that condition (6.4) in [33, Theorem 11.6.3] also holds, observe that, for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$ and $n \geq 1$,

$$|\bar{Q}_i^n(t_2) - \bar{Q}_i^n(t_1)| \leq \frac{N_i^n(t_2) - N_i^n(t_1)}{n} + \frac{Z_i^n(t_2) - Z_i^n(t_1)}{n},$$

where $Z_i^n(t)$, $n \geq 1$, is the number of type-i items that were matched (and left the system) by time t. Then, we have that

$$w(\bar{Q}_i^n, \eta, T) \leq w\left(N_i^n/n, \eta, T\right) + w\left(Z_i^n/n, \eta, T\right), \quad \eta, T > 0.$$

It follows from the representation of Q_i^n in (12) that the oscillations of $\bar{Q}_i^n$ are bounded by those of the time-scaled Poisson processes N_i^n and N_j^n, $j \in \mathcal{E}(i)$. Hence,

$$w(\bar{Q}_i^n, \eta, T) \leq w(N_i^n/n, \eta, T) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}(i)} w(N_j^n/n, \eta, T), \quad j \in \mathcal{E}(i). \tag{51}$$

By the FWLLN for Poisson processes, all the moduli of continuity for the scaled Poisson processes in (51) are controlled, so that, for every $\epsilon > 0$ and $\zeta > 0$, there exists $\eta > 0$ and $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, such that

$$P(w(\bar{Q}_i^n, \eta, T) \geq \epsilon) < \zeta \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_0.$$

Thus, $\{\bar{Q}_i^n : n \geq 1\}$ is $\mathbb{C}$-tight for each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, implying that $\{\bar{Q}^n : n \geq 1\}$ is $\mathbb{C}$-tight in $\mathbb{D}^{|\mathcal{V}|}$. □

We need to uniquely characterize the sub-sequential limit(s) $(\bar{Q}, \nu)$ and, in particular, the probability measures $\{p_u : 0 \le u \le t\}$ in (49). In general, the measure p_u is a function of the state of the limit $\bar{Q}(u)$ at time u. However, in the proof that $\{\nu^n, n \ge 1\}$ is tight in $\mathcal{M}$ we have already identified the limits as the stationary distribution of the CTMC χ. The ergodicity of the latter implies that it possesses a unique stationary distribution, which is independent of the exact value of the fluid limit $\bar{Q}$ of $\bar{Q}^n$. We thus have

LEMMA 8. *For any $T \in [0, \delta)$ and $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ it holds that, as $n \to \infty$,*

$$\nu^n([0,T] \times \mathcal{Z}) \Rightarrow \int_0^T p_u(\mathcal{Z}) du = \pi(\mathcal{Z}) T$$

for $\{p_u : 0 \le u < \delta\}$ in (49). In particular, $p_u := p_{\bar{Q}(u)} : \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}_c|} \mapsto [0,1]$ is the constant function $p_u(\cdot) = \pi(\cdot)$, $0 \le u < \delta$.

It is a standard result that, for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$ and $n \ge 1$, the following process is a square integrable martingale (with respect to the filtration generated by the Poisson processes); see, e.g., [24].

$$\begin{aligned} M_i^n(t) := & \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{N}_i}(Q^n(s-)) \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}(i)} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{P}_j(i)}(Q^n(s-)) \right) dN_j^n(s) \\ & - \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{N}_i}(Q^n(s-)) \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}(i)} n\lambda_j \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{P}_j(i)}(Q^n(s-)) \right) ds, \quad t \ge 0. \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

PROOF OF THEOREM 4. The assumed convergence of the initial condition $\bar{Q}^n(0)$ implies that it is also tight in $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}|}$. To characterize the limit, let us first consider $\bar{Q}_{i_0}^n$. For all $n \ge 1$, we can rewrite (12) for node i_0 as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Q}_{i_0}^n(t) = \bar{Q}_{i_0}^n(0) & + \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{O}_i}(Q(s-)) dN_i^n(s) \\ & - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}(i_0)} \lambda_j \nu^n([0,t] \times \mathcal{P}_j(i_0)) + M_{i_0}^n(t)/n, \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

for M_i^n in (52) and ν^n in (48). By Lemma 2 and the FWLLN for the Poisson process, the second argument to the right of the equality in (53) converges weakly to $\lambda_{i_0} e$ in $\mathbb{D}[0, \delta)$, where e denotes the identity function $e(t) = t$. Since $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{N}_i}(Q(s-))$ is identically equal to 1 for all n large enough, again by Lemma 2, and $M_{i_0}^n/n \Rightarrow 0e$ in $\mathbb{D}[0, \delta)$ as $n \to \infty$, by virtue of Doob's martingale

inequality, the limit (22) follows from Lemma 8 and Lemma 7.3 in [26] (a simple extension to the continuous mapping theorem).

Next, consider $\{\bar{S}^n : n \geq 1\}$. By Lemma 7 it is $\mathbb{C}$-tight in $\mathbb{D}^{|\mathcal{S}|}$ and each element S^n, $n \geq 1$, is distributed as an ergodic CTMC by assumption. Due to (17), $\{\bar{\chi}^n : n \geq 1\}$ is also a $\mathbb{C}$-tight sequence of ergodic CTMC's. It follows from Proposition 9.9 in [28] that there exists an a.s.-finite time $\mathcal{T}$, such that $\bar{\chi}^n \Rightarrow 0e$ in $\mathbb{D}^{|\mathcal{S}|}(\mathcal{T}, \infty)$ as $n \to \infty$. In particular, with d_P denoting the Prohorov metric [4, 14] (here, denoted in terms of the distance between the random elements instead of the distance between their corresponding probability measures in the underlying probability space), it holds that, for any $t > \mathcal{T}$,

$$d_P(\bar{\chi}^n(t), 0) < \epsilon/2. \tag{54}$$

Since any limit point of the tight sequence $\{\bar{\chi}^n : n \geq 1\}$ is continuous, if it is ever larger than 0, then it must be strictly positive over an interval.

Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and let $\|\cdot\|_{tv}$ denote the total-variation norm; see, e.g., [14]. It follows from (18) that for any $t > 0$, there exists n_1, such that $\|\chi^n(t) - \chi^n(\infty)\|_{tv} < \epsilon/2$ for all $n > n_1$. Hence, by the triangle inequality, for any $s < \mathcal{T}$ and $t > \mathcal{T}$ there exists n_2, such that for all $n > n_2$,

$$\|\chi^n(s) - \chi^n(t)\|_{tv} < \epsilon/2, \text{ or, equivalently, } \|\bar{\chi}^n(s) - \bar{\chi}^n(t)\|_{tv} < \epsilon/2. \tag{55}$$

Now, since the Prohorov metric and the total-variation metric (induced by the total variation norm) are equivalent in discrete state spaces, (55) implies that $d_P(\bar{\chi}^n(s), \bar{\chi}^n(t)) < \epsilon/2$ for all $n > n_2$. Together with (54) and the triangle inequality, we obtain

$$d_P(\bar{\chi}^n(s), 0) < \epsilon, \quad 0 < s < \mathcal{T}.$$

The pointwise convergence of $\bar{\chi}^n$ to 0 implies that no limit point of the $\mathbb{C}$-tight sequence $\{\bar{\chi}^n : n \geq 1\}$ can be strictly positive over an interval, so that $\bar{\chi}^n \Rightarrow 0e$, and in turn, $\bar{S}^n \Rightarrow 0e$ as $n \to \infty$ in $\mathbb{D}^{|\mathcal{S}|}[0, \delta)$.

Finally, the dynamics of $\bar{Q}^n$ are fixed over $[0, \rho^n)$, namely, the representation for $\bar{Q}^n_{i_0}$ in (53) holds on $[0, \rho^n)$. If (20) does not hold, then it follows from (22) that $\bar{Q}_{i_0}$ is nondecreasing. Necessarily, $\rho^n \Rightarrow \infty$ as $n \to \infty$, and the convergence of $\bar{Q}^n$ to $\bar{Q}$ can be extended indefinitely. On the other hand, if (20) does hold, then the fluid limit $\bar{Q}_{i_0}$ is strictly decreasing. The first passage time ρ^n in (14) is a continuous mapping by, e.g., Theorem 13.6.4 in [33], so that $\rho^n \Rightarrow \rho$ in $\mathbb{R}$ as $n \to \infty$, for ρ in (21). □

8. Implications to Matching Algorithms on Random Graphs. Our results also have interesting graph-related implications, which we now briefly describe. In graph theory, a *matching on a graph* G (not to be confused with the matching of items discussed thus far) is a subgraph of $\mathbf{G}$ in which each node has exactly one neighbor. The matching is said to be *perfect* if $\mathbf{G}$ and G have the same set of nodes.

A current active line of literature is devoted to the construction of matchings on random graphs (see *e.g.* [15] and the references therein), *i.e.* on graphs in which the existence of edges between the nodes is random. Building on the present model, we propose an original random graph model, together with a construction of a matching on that random graph.

Consider the following procedure. We start with a given (deterministic) graph $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ of size p. Consider a random graph $\mathbf{G}^N$ with N nodes, and the set of nodes is partitioned into p subsets, which we call *types* of nodes. We identify the set of types of nodes of $\mathbf{G}^N$ with $\mathcal{V}$. The edges of $\mathbf{G}^N$ are determined according to the following rule: two nodes u and v of $\mathbf{G}^N$, of respective types i and j, are neighbors in $\mathbf{G}^N$ if and only if $i-j$ in G. The types of the nodes of $\mathbf{G}^N$ are *drawn at random*, according to a given probability measure on $\mathcal{V}$.

A possible construction of $\mathbf{G}^N$, together with a matching on $\mathbf{G}^N$, can be achieved by the following procedure. Fix a matching queue $(G, \lambda, \Phi)_{\mathrm{C}}$.

(i) Initially, all N nodes in $\mathbf{G}^N$ are *undifferentiated* (*i.e.* the types of the nodes are not decided yet), *unmatched* and there are no edges.
(ii) At each point of a Poisson process, say of N_i, take a node u uniformly at random among all undifferentiated ones, assign to u the corresponding type (type i in this case). We then say that u is *differentiated*, and of type i. Then, create an edge in $\mathbf{G}^N$ between u and all the differentiated nodes of any type j such that $i-j$ in G.
(iii) If the set of unmatched neighbors of u is nonempty, apply Φ to select a unique node v in the latter set. We call v the **match** of u, and say that both u and v are *matched* nodes.
(iv) As long as there remain undifferentiated nodes in $\mathbf{G}^N$, reiterate steps (ii) and (iii).

At the end of the procedure, all the nodes are differentiated. The various nodes may be matched or not, and the *matching* we have constructed on $\mathbf{G}^N$ is the subgraph consisting in the matched nodes in $\mathbf{G}^N$ and the edges between matched couples. Moreover, if we now let N increase to infinity then, by the strong law of large numbers, w.p.1 $\mathbf{G}^N$ is p-partite (all types of nodes are represented in $\mathbf{G}^N$, and there is no edge between any two nodes

of the same type), and the proportions of nodes of the various types tend to the measure μ_λ defined by (6).

As it relies on an exploration of the nodes and the progressive attachment of explored ones to the graph, the latter construction is related to the procedure of uniform random pairing; see [34]. This latter procedure leads to the so-called configuration model introduced by Bollobas [5] (see also *e.g.* [27]), generating a realization of a random graph where the *degree*, i.e., the number of neighbors of each node, is fixed beforehand.



FIG 10. *Constructing a perfect matching on a random 4-partite graph using the graph of Figure 2*

For any $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$, let T_N denote the termination time of the procedure, *i.e.* the Nth point of the superposition of the p Poisson processes. For $j \in [\![1,p]\!]$ and all $t \le T_N$, let

$$\mathbf{Q}_j^N(t) = \text{Number of unmatched differentiated nodes of type } j \text{ in } \mathbf{G}^N \text{ at } t.$$

It is then immediate that the process $\mathbf{Q}^N := \left(\mathbf{Q}_1^N, ..., \mathbf{Q}_p^N\right)$ coincides on $[0, T_N]$ with the queue process Q of the matching queue $(G, \lambda, \Phi)_{\text{C}}$ when both have the same input, and the same initial condition $\mathbf{Q}^N(0) = Q(0) = (0, \dots, 0)$. Therefore, Theorems 2 and 3 imply the following.

COROLLARY 6. *Assume that the graph G is connected and non-bipartite.*

(i) There exists an admissible matching policy Φ and $\lambda \in \text{NCOND}_{\text{C}}(G)$ such that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{Q}_j^n(t) = 0 \text{ w.p.1.}, \quad \text{for all } j \in [\![1,p]\!].$$

(ii) G is separable if and only if, for all admissible policy Φ and for all $\lambda \in \text{NCOND}_{\text{C}}(G)$,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{Q}_j^n(t) = 0 \text{ w.p.1.}, \quad \text{for all } j \in [\![1,p]\!].$$

Hence, whenever G is non-bipartite, there exist an intensity $\lambda \in \text{NCOND}_{\text{C}}(G)$ and a matching policy Φ leading to an asymptotic perfect matching. Nevertheless, it follows from (ii) that, except for the case of separable graphs (which, from the point of view of the independent sets present in queue, amounts to complete graphs - see Section 3.2), a greedy matching algorithm could fail to obtain a perfect matching, as there always exists a 'bad' priority policy, namely, a matching policy leading to an imperfect matching on $\mathbf{G}^N$ for a large enough N.

9. Summary and Future Research. In this paper we proved that matching queues on non-separable and non-bipartite graphs satisfying NCOND need not be stable. Our proof employed a fluid-limit whose characterization builds on estimating the stationary distribution of a related fast-time-scale CTMC.

There are many directions for future research. We specify three which we are currently investigating.

Identifying bottlenecks. The fluid limit may be used to construct a procedure determining the "bottlenecks" (namely, unstable) nodes of general unstable matching queues. Moreover, when the stationary distribution of the fast-time-scale CTMC can be computed explicitly, the fluid limit provides the exact rate of increase of the queues corresponding to the unstable nodes.

Non-Graphical Models. In our model, items depart the system by pairs. However, in many applications (e.g., manufacturing and assemble-to-order systems) matchings can occur in groups that are larger than 2 (as, for example, in [16]). Thus, it remains to establish an analogue to NCOND when the compatibility between items cannot be represented by a graph.

Applications to Matchings on Graphs. The observation following Corollary 6 is reminiscent of the difficulty of constructing a perfect matching for large graphs using a greedy algorithm. This opens two possible directions for future investigations: (i) connect the condition for existence of a perfect matching in Corollary 6, to Tutte's condition [31] for deterministic graphs, and (ii) investigate a possible generalization of the algorithm in Section 8 to the case where each node is not connected to all of the nodes of its compatible types but, for example, its connectivity follows a given degree distribution.

REFERENCES

[1] I. Adan and G. Weiss. Exact FCFS matching rates for two infinite multi-type sequences. *Operations Research*, 60(2):475–489, 2012.

[2] I. Adan and G. Weiss. A skill based parallel service system under FCFS-ALIS – steady state, overloads, and abandonments. *Stochastic Systems*, **4**(1), 250–299, 2014.

[3] F. Baccelli and P. Brémaud. *Elements of Queueing Theory*, 2nd ed. Springer, 2002.

[4] P. Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*, 2nd ed. Wiley, New York. 1999.

[5] B. Bollobas. *Random Graphs*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.

[6] M. Bramson. Instability of FIFO queueing networks. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **4**(2), 414–431. 1994.

[7] M. Bramson. State space collapse with application to heavy traffic limits for multiclass queueing networks., *Queueing Systems*, **30**, (1-2), 89–140, 1998.

[8] M. Bramson. *Stability of queueing networks*. Springer. 2008.

[9] A. Busić, V. Gupta, and J. Mairesse. Stability of the bipartite matching model. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, 45(2):351–378, 2013.

[10] R. Caldentey, E.H. Kaplan, and G. Weiss. FCFS infinite bipartite matching of servers and customers. *Adv. Appl. Probab*, 41(3):695–730, 2009.

[11] J.G. Dai. On positive Harris recurrence of multiclass queueing networks: a unified approach via fluid limit models. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 49–77, 1995.

[12] J.G. Dai and R.J. Williams Existence and uniqueness of semimartingale reflecting Brownian motions in convex polyhedrons. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 40 **1** 1–40, 1996.

[13] A.E. Davis, S. Mehrotra, V. Kilambi, O. Perry, J.J. Friedewald, D.P. Ladner. Addressing US national geographic disparity in kidney transplantation by creating sharing partnerships, *Working Paper* 2015.

[14] R. Durrett. *Probability: theory and examples.* Wadsworth and Brooks/cole, Pacific Grove, California. 1991.

[15] D. Gamarnik and D.A. Goldberg. Randomized Greedy Algorithms for Independent Sets and Matchings in Regular Graphs: Exact Results and Finite Girth Corrections. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, **19**(1), 61–85, 2010.

[16] I. Gurvich and A. Ward. On the dynamic control of matching queues. *Stochastic Systems*, **4**(2), 1–45, 2014.

[17] Ph. Hall. On Representatives of Subsets. *J. London Math. Soc.*, **10**(1) 26–30, 1935.

[18] P.J. Hunt and T.G. Kurtz Large loss networks. *Stochastic Processes and Their Appl.* **53**(2) 363–378, 1994.

[19] T.G. Kurtz. Averaging for martingale problems and stochastic approximations. *Appl. Stochastic Anal., Proc.* US-French Workshop. Lecture Notes in Control Inform. Sci., Vol. 177 (Springer, Berlin), 186–209, 1992.

[20] L. Lovász, J. Pelikán and K. Vesztergombi. *Discrete Mathematics - Elementary and Beyond*. Springer, 2003.

[21] S.H. Lu and P.R. Kumar Distributed scheduling based on due dates and buffer priorities. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control.* **36**(12), 1406–1416, 1991.

[22] J. Luo and J. Zhang. Staffing and control of instant messaging contact centers. *Operations Research*, **61**(2), 328–343, 2013.

[23] J. Mairesse and P. Moyal. Stability of the stochastic matching model. *ArXiv math.PR 1404.6677*.

[24] G. Pang, R. Talreja, W. Whitt. Martingale proofs of many-server heavy-traffic limits for Markovian queues. *Probability Surveys*, **4**, 193–267, 2007.

[25] Perry, O., W. Whitt. An ODE for an overloaded X model involving a stochastic averaging principle. *Stochastic Systems*, **1** (1), 17–66, 2011.

[26] O. Perry and W. Whitt. A fluid limit for an overloaded X model via a stochastic averaging principle. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, **38**(2) 294 – 349, 2013.

[27] R. Van der Hofstad. *Random Graphs and Complex Networks.* Lecture Notes, 2013.

[28] Ph. Robert. *Stochastic networks and queues*. Springer-Verlag, 2003.

[29] A.N. Rybko and A.L. Stolyar. Ergodicity of stochastic processes describing the operations of open queueing networks. *Problems Inform. Transmission* **28**, 3–26, 1992 (in Russian).

[30] R. Talreja and W. Whitt. Fluid models for overloaded multiclass many-server queueing systems with first-come, first-served routing. *Management Science*, **54**(8), 1513–1527, 2008.

[31] W. T. Tutte. The Factorization of Linear Graphs. *J. London Math. Soc.* **22** 107–111, 1947.

[32] , W. Whitt. The pointwise stationary approximation for $M_t/M_t/s$ queues is asymptotically correct as the rates increase. *Management Science*, **37**(3), 207–314, 1991.

[33] W. Whitt. *Stochastic-Process Limits*. Springer, 2002.

[34] N. C. Wormald. Differential equations for random processes and random graphs. *Annals of Applied Probability* **5**(4), 1217–1235, 1995.

[35] S. Wu, J. Zhang and R.Q. Zhang. Management of A Shared Spectrum Network in Wireless Communications. *Working paper*, HKUST.

Laboratoire de Mathématiques appliquées, Université de Technologie de Compiègne
Industrial Engineering and Management Sciences, Northwestern University
E-mail: pascal.moyal@utc.fr
ohad.perry@northwestern.edu